

Sorin Cerin

The  
Coaxiological  
Logic

**SORIN CERIN**  
- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -

**SORIN CERIN**

**THE  
COAXIOLOGICAL  
LOGIC**

**2020**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Copyright © SORIN CERIN 2020

Sorin Cerin. All rights reserved. No part of this publications may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of Sorin Cerin.

Manufactured in the United States of America

**ISBN: 9798630561305**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

This book have been published for first time by Paco Publishing House in Romanian language in Romania

**Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României**

**CERIN, SORIN**

**Logica coaxiologică/ Sorin Cerin,-**

**București ; PACO, 2007**

**ISBN 978-973-8314-79-5**

This book have been published also in Romanian language in the United States of America

**ISBN-10: 1497436125**

**ISBN-13: 978-1497436121**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Motto:**

**"Only mortals seek immortality  
because immortals do not know  
what this is. "**

**The author**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The Coaxiological Logic is part of Coaxialism, the philosophical system created by me, about which the philosophy doctor Henrieta Anisoara Serban, made the following review:

***The Coaxialism, book review by Henrieta Anisoara Serban, PhD in philosophy, Researcher, Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Romanian Academy, written in 2007 :***

“This book represents an audacious contribution to contemporary philosophy. Not a mere synthesis, the volume brings to the fore a original vision concerning the truth (and the illusion), the absolut and the life, into the philosophical conversation of humanity. “What else are we, but a mad dream of an angel, taken up with himself, lost somewhere within the hierarchy of numerology?” (p.5), asks the author, triggering a captivating odyssey, with an opening towards the philosophy of conscience, contextualism and mind philosophy, that is relevant for the critique of the reprezentationalism and postmodernism. Coaxialism is structured in 11 chapters. They may be interpreted in triads. Therefore, the first three chapters could stand as an introduction to the thematic realm of coaxiology. The first chapter is concerned with “The

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

purpose, the hierarchy, the birth of numerology and of the Primordial Factor ONE”, the second chapter treats “The Instinct, the Matrix, the Order and Disorder, the Dogma”, and the third chapter “The State of the fact, the Opened Knowledge and the Closed Knowledge, the Coaxialism and the Coaxiology”. Then, the next triad would be constituted by the interpretation of three aspects related to human exemplarity, via the chapters entitled “The Print and the Karmic Print, the Geniality”, “Love or the individual Conscience of the Human Being” and “Consciousness or the knowledge in Coaxiology”. And, the last triad, say, of a semantical and hermeneutical nature, approaches “Reflections on philosophy, the Alien within the Being, the Dimension of Life”, “The Semantical Coaxiology” and “The Semantical Truth, the Semantical Knowledge, the Semantical Mirror and the Reason of Creation”. The tenth chapter, named “Semantical Ontology, Neoontology, and Coaxiology, the Semantical Structuring of Our Matrix”, capitalizes on the ideas from the preceding philosophical architecture. Eventually, the last chapter offers specific mathematical models of the ideas and concepts that are exposed within the book, along with the relationships among them. In a Schopenhauerian, Nietzschean and Wittgensteinian architectonics of the philosophical ideas, the author states the principles of what he labels as the “coaxialism”: 1. The only true philosophy is the one accepting that Man does neither know the Truth, and implicitly, nor philosophy, 2. Man shall never neither know the Absolute Truth nor the Absolute Knowledge, for his entire existence is based on the Illusion of Life, 3. Any philosophical system or philosopher pretending that he or she speaks the Truth is a liar, 4. The Coaxialism is, by excellence, a philosophy that does NOT pretend that it speaks the Truth, yet accepting certain applications sustaining the reference of the Illusion of Life to the Truth,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

5. The Essence of the Truth consists in its reflection in the Elements appeared before it, as there are the elements of the Opened Knowledge deriving from the Current Situation, 6. The Coaxialism accepts the operations with the opposites of the opposites of the Existence, with or without a compulsory reference to such opposites, determining the coaxiology, 7. Each Antithetical has, to the Infinity, another Antithetical, which is identical to it, 8. The farther is an Antithetical situated, that is the more opposites are intercalated (between itself and its Antithetical), the more accentuated the similarities, and the less opposites are intercalated between the two Elements, the more accentuated the dissimilarities, 9. As well as we can conceive Universes without a corresponding substrate into the Existence, we can conceive Knowledge without a corresponding substrate into the essence, that is, without a subject, 10. The Factor is going to be always the opposite of the infinity to which it would relate as a finite quantity, the same way as the Knowledge relates to the lack of knowledge, and Life, to Death. Within a Coaxial perspective, the Factor shall be an equivalent to God, the Unique Creator, and yet Aleatory in relationship with its worlds 11. Within the Worlds of each Creator, unique and Aleatory Factor are to be reflected all the other Creators, all the unique and Aleatory Factors, as numbers, starting from ONE, that is the Primordial Factor, all the way to the Infinite minus ONE Factors of Creation, all Unique and Aleatory. (p.5-7) Certainly, someone may ask how is such a unitary cuantics going to be sustained? But to rise seriously such a question would mean to miss the point that here we have mathematical metaphors, suggestive models, and not a calculus leading to the Metaphysical Truth (which would at the same time contradict the very coaxiological principles). The bounty of capital letters and underlining in the text speak volumes of the American experience of the author,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

emphasising as well, with a certain irony, the endeavour to capture meaning, the thirst for absolute, for perfection, for the Truth and for the pure idea, central to all philosophies. Thus, given the following quote, I can at once offer exemplification for the above observation and clarify a column-idea of this intriguing work: “The Coaxiology is a philosophy capable of determining in depth the importance of the Factor (...) – which is also a number, I have to note, among other aspects it provided. It is produced by the Essence of an Element of the Matrix Status Quo, or by the Instinct. (...) The Factor is going to be the demiurge who, via his own capacity of consciousness should include in himself always new and newer Elements of the Closed Knowledge, also assessing, though, without knowing them into detail, Elements of the Opened Knowledge. (...) Man is such a Factor despite the fact that he is situated hierarchically much lower in comparison to the Great Creators.” (p.51-2) The author explains the coaxial (and eventually, structuralist) manner to investigate the world, as a paradoxical mix of good and evil, divine and demonic, humane and rational, a mix giving birth to the Illusion of Life and being sustained, grace of a feed-back, precisely by this Illusion of Life. (P.53 sq.) “Don’t you know that only in the lakes with muddy bottom the water-lily blossom?” was asking, the 20th century Romanian philosopher, Lucian Blaga, rhetorically, and already “coaxial”. The philosophical poetry of Mihai Eminescu is consecrated to the illusion of life. It reflects, as an illustration, in the poem “Floare albastra?” (“Blue Flower”, a Romantic motive, and yet, a coaxial motive, that appears within the German literature, at Novalis, or at Leopardi) the paradoxical marriage of the infinite with the wishes. This is a metaphor for the paradoxical marriage between the philosophical Knowledge, aiming at the absolute and the terrestrial Knowledge, through love, afflicting human’s heart, as a

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

creative factor, stimulated by affection. As well as in his literature, Sorin Cerin accomplishes to express himself capitalizing at once the universal philosophy and on the great Romanian philosophical successes. For example, as she turns the pages of the book, the reader may have glimpses of Schopenhauer's philosophy – let us recall that the human being, as a knowing subject, knows himself as a subject, endowed with a will and that he cannot become pure subject of knowledge unless his will vanishes, in order to eliminate the reference to what one can wish in relationship with the knowledge, since the representation is maimed by desire ( *The World as Will and Representation*). The book sends to Nietzsche's philosophy – see for instance the idea that “The apparent world is the only True one; the ‘real’ world is sheer lie”, from *The Twilight of the Idols*, ch. 3, aphorism 2. A more sensitive reader would find analogies with the philosophy of Emil Cioran, in *The Trouble with Being Born*. Coaxialism may recall Wittgenstein II in that philosophy represents the (re)organisation of what we have always known, while language is to be considered an “activity”, a “game” framed into certain “forms of life”, a summation of different phenomena, maybe related to one another, but in very different manners. As for the “Truth” one may associate the following suggestive line from the *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford, 1953, 9, § 68: the strength of the thread does not rely in the fact that each fibre goes from end to end but in the overlapping of many fibres. At the same time, the idea of a creative factor “struggling” with the world to draw forth only partial and paradoxical Truths has from the very beginning strong echoes with the philosophy of mystery, as it appears within the work of Lucian Blaga. A similar analogy may be made with the figure of the “ironist” (proposed by Richard Rorty), at her turn, “struggling” with the world, in order to educate herself into the various vocabularies (read “parallel

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

cultural realities”). The comparison with Blaga does not stop here, the researcher connoisseur identifying avenues of investigation towards the “Luciferic” versus “Paradisiac” Knowledge dichotomy, in analogy with the closed – opened Knowledge, with the Matrix, with the creative factor, etc. The work is also remarkable given its distinct literary qualities, the intriguing specific philosophical language developed in close relationship to the literary print, a distinguishing note for an interesting philosophical debut.”

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**CONTENT**

**CHAPTER I**

**The Basics of the Coaxiological Logic and Principles of Logical Function**

**CHAPTER II**

**The Intangible Forms**

**CHAPTER III**

**The Determinations of Logic Function, Tangentiality**

**CHAPTER IV**

**False or True, Intervention or Non-intervention**

**CHAPTER V**

**Relativity and Complementarity of the Logical Function defined through the Coaxiological Truth**

**CHAPTER VI**

**The Determinants and Basic Indeterminants**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## **CHAPTER I**

### **The Basics of the Coaxiological Logic and Principles of Logical Function**

**The Principles of Coaxiological Logic called and Logical Function or "Logical Continuum" are as follows:**

**The first principle of the Logical Function is:**

**"The Tangentiability of Logical Function defines the "Logical Continuum" formed from the "Infinite Continuum" but and from the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, thus is redefined compared to the asymptotism of Intangible Forms, and "the Infinite Continuum", includes the Universal Pure Language.**

**Tangentiability is the one underlying the Coaxiological Logic, removing asymptotism, respective the Asymptotic Function, as the basis of the All, and transforming her into an annex left by Intangible Forms in this All.**

**Thus, through Tangentiability, have resulted common points, and any axiom, characteristic or expression can become at any time a principle of the**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Logical Function, how any principle can become an axiom, characteristic or expression, because all are one, and one, all, and by principle in Coaxialism is understood a sense that guides this philosophy. "**

**The second principle of the Logical Function is:**

**"Determination of the parallelism between principles and characteristics, because the characteristics become principles and the principles, characteristics, but also in, to determine the accumulation of other functions within them, making them essential and becoming their essence."**

**The third principle of Logical Function is:**

**"The Logical Function is responsible for determining, but and for defining through it itself of the Coaxiological Truth."**

**The fourth principle is:**

**"The relativity and complementarity of the Logical Function is defined through the Coaxiological Truth."**

**The fifth principle of the Logical Function is:**

**"The Coaxiological Truth, which belongs to the Logical Function, is a Relative Truth, Neosemiotic, Substitutive, Motivating and Complementary, and it is defined in its totality by the Logical Function, without the Logical Function being defined in its totality through the Coaxiological Truth."**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Therefore, the Logical Function is a Function which, viewed from the perspective of the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, it is defined as including one of its Truths, **namely the Coaxiological Truth that redefines her at the same time.**

\*

Immortality is a simple and beautiful Illusion that will remain to the mortals in this world, what will become sometime, lost by me forever.

Why do I start a book about Logic with Immortality?

What is the connection between Logic and Immortality?

Immortality is precisely the reverse of our Logic, Logic that is part of the Illusion of our own Life, being an Illusory Logic.

Why?

Because Immortality is opposite to the logical nature of life, in a world where every one dies, but can remain in immortality only in comparison with mortals, without being able to be demonstrated ever and the possibility that the immortality to become immortal and for immortals.

Why?

Because no one can know in its capacity of mortal if he can be immortal in a world where everyone else is immortal.

In that world, none of the immortals would know what immortality is because they would not know, at what to report her, not being: The Death.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Only mortals seek immortality because immortals do not know what this is.**

This is and the problem of current Logic, which being a Logic of Illusion, due to the Illusion of Life, we do not know whether this immortal Logic of Illusion can also be an immortal Logic, in the other side, different from Illusion.

Why is a Logic of Illusion?

Any Logic is necessarily Incidental in the Primordial Element of Knowledge, because only the Random Creator can CREATE, and the Creation is Created once and not several times, because absolutely any Creation that has a precedent in another Creation is Destiny!

The Logic of Knowledge is part of Creation, what defines it as being a Logic Created, and not an Uncreated Logic, because absolutely everything what is part of our world of the Knowledge, for example, it comes us in the form of Creation and, not devoid of it.

Thus, Logic must necessarily be Created by something, and this something, I have also written in my other books that it is the Creative Factor and Unique Incidentally, which once with its Creation that was determined once and only once, this one has been accomplished, and once this Creation is completed, it has included within it and the Logic of Knowledge, as long as the Creation is made perfect in Knowledge, as being a Word of Universal Pure Language.

We, humans, live in a world with Destiny, in a world where Creation was perfect before being we, the humans, therefore and, the Logic of Creation, was created.

Between the Logic of Creation and the Logic, in the capacity of, Word of Universal Pure Language is a big difference, because the Logic of Knowledge is totally different from Logic, in the capacity of, Word of Universal

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Pure Language, being a Logic with all the characteristics of Logic, in the capacity of, the Word of Universal Pure Language, at which also participates and the Knowledge, within which, this one is conducted, together with to Creation, which is also interposed into Knowledge by the Unique and the Happening.

Thus, in order to obtain the Logic of Creation, both, the Logic, Word of the Universal Pure Language and the Knowledge participated, in which the Creation takes place, but and the Unique and the Incident.

It can be noticed, that apart from Knowledge, which is the Unique Word of the Universal Pure Language, in which the Logic of Creation unfolds, all others, the same as and the Logic, Word of the Universal Pure Language, the Creation, the Unique, but and the Happening intervene on the basis of the Analogy of the All, about which I have already written, being the one through which every Word of Universal Pure Language is in all the other Words of this Language, because every Word of this language becomes an All which replaces this Language, but, an All, which not only, that replaces this Language, but he includes him, in his turn.

Thus, on the basis of this principle, are found within the Knowledge and other Words - Matrices, such as the Logic, Creation, unique, and Happening, of course, alongside the whole infinity, of others and other such Words of Universal Pure Language, which become thus implicitly and the Elements of Knowledge, as well as Knowledge becomes Element in its turn, within the developments determined by these Words of Universal Pure Language.

Analogy of Everything can be found in the development - matrix, of Knowledge in the "Ego" of the Primordial Factor and Creative Factors and Unique Incidentally, where each such Creator Factor and Unique

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Incidentally represents the Image reflected in Knowledge, of a Word of the Universal Pure Language.

Once the Logic is Incidentally and is part of the Creation, which is and Unique, means that Logic, in the capacity of, Word of the Universal Pure Language is of so overwhelming importance for the Happening, that this determines it in the Creation from Knowledge?

Is there a connection between the Word - Logic, within the Universal Pure Language and with the mode of development - matrix, of the Word - Knowledge within this Language, in the sense that the Logic would intervene alongside the Creation, Unique and Happening for the designation of the Instinct, Absolute Truth, and "Ego" of the Primordial Factor together with the Creative Factors?

Logic determines the Creative Factors that by their quintessence meet all the elements necessary for the determination of Creation but and of the Logic of Creation?

If the Logic is in Creation and the Creation is a Word with attributive and disjunctive functions of the Universal Pure Language, means that along with the functional attributive mode of the End, Beginning and Origin also possesses the functional disjunctivity of the Unique and the Happening, the disjunctive mode designated by separating the functionality of the Unique and the Happening for each Word in part, with attributive functions that are transmitted from one to the other.

This is one of the features that define the attributive functions from the disjunctive ones.

The fact that Logic is in our world of the Word - Knowledge in the Creation of Creative Factors and, Unique Incidentally, means that it can be transmitted both to the End, the first Word - Matrix of the Universal Pure Language, with attributive functions, therefore transmissible how much it can be and, within the Unique and the Happening of the two Matrix Words with

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

disjunctive functions, because all these participate in defining the Word- Matrix of Creation.

Is the Creation thus, a Logical functor which has an argument of its which it can be found in the Logical Expression Created?

Yes! The argument of this functor is precisely the "Created" Expression!

This fact entitles us to believe that Creation is the one that determines Logic, although until now we have established that the Word -Matrix of the Creation determines Knowledge, and Knowledge NOT means and Logic implicitly, because the Logic is a Word-Matrix, different from, the Word-Matrix of the Creation, which, reported, to any other Word -Matrix from the point of view of Forms of Expression, Matrix, it can be totally something else.

Thus, the Logic within Knowledge, which is due to Creation, is one, and the Logic within another Word - Matrix is totally something else.

The Word - Matrix of Creation is not the one that has Created the Logic, because this one came about on the basis of some functions, where, firstly the conjunctive function of the Analogy of Everything intervened, which mirrors the fact that each Word-Matrix is found in all the other Words - Matrix, because it is, not only a unity in the diversity of Words - Matrix, but it is defined as if it were the All.

Thus, in order to find out, through what namely, the Logic of Creation was transmitted, through the group of Words - Matrix with attributive or disjunctive functions, we must first of all find out what namely the Logic is and what characteristics it has to have in order to be determined as such.

However, we will only determine an Image of the Logic of Creation that has been accomplished just as the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Creation through which it only occurs us once, the rest being an Image of this Logic projected through Destiny for us.

Even though any image is NOT equivalent to, the real, but becomes turned back, especially if this one takes place in the Mirror, as is also the Mirror of Knowledge, does not mean that certain characteristics of that Imagine can not be determined, even turned back, as I claim they occur us due to the effect of the mirror where the letters are read in reverse if they are reflected in a Mirror that I consider similar to the Mirror of Knowledge, because any Mirror reflected in another Mirror will Create the Image of Infinite, of Endless of Eternity, located in parallelism, because only when we place two Mirrors face to face we will be able to see undistorted by the Mirror of the Knowledge, the Infinite Creation from this one, removing the Destiny and thus approaching us by the Truth of what undistorted Creation means. YES!

Through the Parallel Mirrors we can see how namely the Creation without Destiny looks, which was accomplished only once, and which conceals in her womb the Logic, the one which will give to the Knowledge new valences of Mirroring of it into itself.

We, humans, see and perceive Logic as being, I quote from the Romanian Encyclopaedic Dictionary Vol. III, Political Publishing House, Bucharest 1965: "a science whose object is to establish the conditions of the correctness of thought, of the forms and general laws of the fair reasoning, conformed through the order of ideas with the legal organization of the objective reality."

My question is why not and of the subjective reality?

Certainly the political situation at that time justified the omission of this argument.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Logic is, therefore, perceived by us as being a science whose object is to establish the conditions of the correctness of thought.

I wonder, in order to establish such conditions is necessary a certain science, or the respective science is nothing more but a certain Phenomenon on which thinking is focused, a Phenomenon due to the Knowledge and implicitly of its Mirror that determines thus through the Image, filtered by, Knowledge of the Creation in which it is located and Logic as a Word -Matrix whose reverberations are in Creation?

In particular, I tend to believe this aspect than on that one, that Logic would be a science.

After me, the Word - Matrix, Science, is something else than what we are structuring through the Meaning of the Science Expression, which defines a structured content on certain characteristics given by Knowledge and which can be valid only within the world with Destiny, but not and without the Destiny, because the Science seen by us through the Illusion of Life always includes the Unknown, on which tends to cover him once with the Destiny.

This "covering" lies only in the worlds with Destiny where the Creation that is accomplished once, thus Knowing Everything leaves place to the Destiny for it to unfold through the Illusion of the Unknown, though the Creation and Everything is Known eternally, once with the Unique Creation given by the Happening what became Random of the Creative Factors and Unique Incidentally.

Thus, Science is a Word -Matrix, whose Image distorted by the Mirror of the Creation comes to us thus, through its conjunctive, attributive and disjunctive functions.

Thus, the same it also happens with the Logic that comes to us in the form of Science, fact what means that both the Word - Matrix, Science, as and that of the Logic

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

come to us on a common path because they overlap, in our understanding.

Even if science would be replaced by anything else, but which to represent their characteristics and relationships in the correctness of the Knowledge of the "anything", all, science of that "something", would be called and all, the characteristics of Logic in our mind would receive.

Therefore, the Image given by the Mirror of Knowledge unites us more Words- Matrices to determine the Meaning of one or the other.

This fact determines us the conjunctural function which is in Knowledge and reaches this one through the other three functions: Conjunctive, Attributive, and Disjunctive.

The conjunctural function is determined through the capacity of Words - Matrices of to unite their characteristics (one or more) in front of a Conjunctor.

**One of these is Destiny.**

Why is Destiny the Conjunctor and not Knowledge, for example, with its Mirror which can thus define the union of one or more characteristics of the Words -Matrices and then to design them in its worlds?

Because the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, respective the Mirror of Knowledge as can be defined, can not have the quality of a Conjunctor in this case, because absolutely any Word-Matrix, that is reflected in it does so only through the Creation which takes place only once, and once with this production the whole Creation is Known and not Known partly as in the worlds with Destiny, where besides Logic, which in Creation has a role, at most, of "law", I put this word in quotation marks because is not the most appropriate to determine what I mean but it does not exist none closer at the same time of what I want to relate, and more than that at this level can not be the matter of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

lawfulness, because it does not exist an Event-Phenomenon, Primordial, that will only intervene in the phase of the Lack of the Periodic from Semantic, or of the Neosemantic from this.

*When I referred to the role of "law" of Logic, I thought of its characteristics of establishing relations between characteristics, being a sort of Mirror of Knowledge but with different characteristics to Knowledge, and the quality of Mirror of the Logic no longer presupposes finding the Unique Creation in the Parallel Mirrors from the worlds with Destiny, but the parallelism between the two Mirrors of Knowledge and Logic gives birth to Thinking and its perceptions in the worlds with Destiny!*

*Even if and Logic in quality of Word-Matrix of the Universal Pure Language can be defined through its Mirror which has characteristics different from the Mirror of Knowledge, because the Mirror of Logic is responsible for features such as structuring, dimensioning, but also connecting or determining of some Events or Phenomena of the Knowledge, in the moment of reflecting the Logical Mirror in the Mirror of Knowledge, parallelism, which in the worlds with Destiny, has determined the Thinking.*

*What purpose still has the intervention of Word - Matrix, Science, for example and why is this, Word - Matrix?*

*Every possible Known or Unknown notion by the human being is in turn a Word -Matrix, of the Universal Pure Language which develops a certain Expression of its in the connection with other Words - Matrices.*

*For Knowledge, this Word - Matrix is Science, but for other Words- Matrices like Knowledge, this Word - Matrix is no longer Science, but has a certain Meaning for each Word - Matrix in part.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*The fact that it intervenes within the human knowledge as being Science, being always or in most cases associated with Logic, means that certain characteristics of that Word -Matrix determined by us as being Science are transmitted through Logic.*

*Although the Logic possesses a Mirror, please do not make the mistake of to confuse the Mirror of Logic with the Mirror of Knowledge, and to assign from the characteristics of the Semantic, Neosemantic, Periodic and Lack of the Mirror of Logic.*

*Precisely the fact that the Mirror of Logic has different characteristics it helps us, on we the humans, to Think.*

*If until now was made always a historical confusion in philosophy, between Thinking and Knowledge, attributing to the Thinking, precisely the Gnoseological branch of Knowledge, respectively the Knowledge Theory; was totally wrong, since although between Thinking and Knowledge are certain interdependencies, we must NOT, under any circumstances, make the millenary mistake of mankind of to assign the Thinking to the Knowledge!*

Thinking is not Knowledge, but it is above all, the channels through which let the Knowledge to flow, toward its initiator.

These channels are given by the Mirror of Logic, which being parallel to the Mirror of Knowledge leaves to the human being the ability to reason.

Human reasoning is given by the parallelism between the two Mirrors, namely the Mirror of Knowledge and the Mirror of Logic.

If this parallelism was not, the man would suddenly Know, and this Knowledge would remain a Knowledge, empty of any relational content with other and other aspects that might complete it.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Once Logic is another different Mirror, but parallel to the Mirror of Knowledge that occurs through the attributive and implicitly disjunctive functions within Knowledge, it means that Logic intervenes in quality of Word- Matrix of the Universal Pure Language within the attributive functions through the Word- Matrix, End, which is in fact the first Word within the attributive functions, being always "bombarded" with the disjunctive function of the Unique and of the Happening.

Thus, the Logic has something from each in this hypostasis.

Why is the Word - Matrix, End, the first in the chain of the five Words - Matrices with attributive functions?

Why not another Word - Matrix, such as Beginning or Creation, Origin or anything else?

If we think even through the Illusion of Life and Logical Coefficient 2, we notice that each Beginning begins with an End, of "something," because if that "something" does not end it can not begin "something else", which means that in the Beginning of that "something else" is actually the End of "something," thus, each Beginning Begins with the End, as well as each End begins with the Beginning.

Thus, the Beginning of the five Words-Matrices with attributive functions can only be the End of this Beginning.

Therefore, the first Word - Matrix will be the End, and the second the Beginning, followed by Origin, Creation, and Knowledge.

About the other Words-Matrices, I have described in detail in another book of mine, the cause for which are enumerated in this way.

If Knowledge receives the Mirror through the Semantic, what is an attribute of Creation from where it

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

receives the Logical Mirror that has nothing in common with the Semantic than in the parallelism of the two Mirrors of Logic and Knowledge?

*The Logic, just like Knowledge, is determined from an attributive point of view in Knowledge by Creation, which is the Word -Matrix what directly defines Knowledge.*

*However, the Logic has nothing to do with the Semantic attributive function of Creation, which determines the Semantic Mirror of the Infinity from Knowledge, but instead Logic has the entire attributive range that it has and Knowledge starting with the End, the Beginning, the Origin and the Creation, also has the disjunctive range of the Unique and the Happening the same as the Knowledge, is subjected as all Words -Matrix at the Analogy of the Everything or at the universal conjunctive function, and thus, should be equivalent with the Knowledge or similar to this, if not complementary, in the worst case and yet the Logic is not so.*

*What does this mean?*

*The fact that the Logic is determined and by another function, different from the conjunctive, attributive and disjunctive functions, a function that I will call : the Logical Function.*

*Why?*

*Because it would be in vain the Semantic Mirror of the Infinity from Knowledge if it were not the Mirrors's parallelism, if this Mirror would not have in what and in whom to reflect itself, which led to the logical function.*

*The logical function is characterized through parallelism, and namely will always become a parallel with the Words -Matrices, through which it propagates, always determining properties parallel to the properties of the respective, Words -Matrices, and these parallel properties are given to the Words -Matrices, on which the logical*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*function defines them, such as the Word - Matrix, Logic, in the present case.*

Thus, Logic does not intervene upon Knowledge just through the attributive, conjunctive and disjunctive functions, but also through the logical function.

Compared to the attributive functions which are determined from one Matrix Word to the Other, or the disjunctive functions, which are determined at each Word - Matrix, separately, the logical functions are determined through other functions and can incorporate within them a plurality of functions, which clothe them like in a cocoon, but this cocoon has the logical function as a kernel.

Thus, another property of the logical function alongside parallelism would be that of the cumulation of functions which always find their kernel or essence in the logical function.

Therefore, the logical function is also the function which, alongside parallelism and the cumulation of functions, determines the essence of this cumulation of functions, but also the essence of the All.

Thus the essence consists in parallelism and the cumulation of functions which is reflected upon the Words - Matrices of the Universal Pure Language.

The logical function is determined by the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, which is at the basis of the essence of Everything, precisely through the parallelism it reflects upon this one, through the continually reporting upon the "Infinite Continuum" that is Everything, but and Everything from behind of the Everything, essence, which is also found in the fact of to be, and the reporting of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness to the totality of the Expressions of the Words - Matrices of the Universal Pure Language, where these Words, each, in part, have their own Expression, becoming functors which find their as argument in

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

reporting to the Unique Expression of Pure Universal Consciousness.

So, reporting to the Unique Expression of Universal Consciousness is the supreme argument of these functors, which are the Words of the Universal Pure Language and NOT the Unique Expression itself.

This aspect must be specified because the Unique Expression is not the sum of these Expressions, but at what namely these Expressions are reporting.

From here starts and parallelism, which within Knowledge is called the Logic, which is at the basis of the thinking and reasoning of the human being.

This fact demonstrates us that not the Word - Matrix, Logic, is the one that has Logic, or holds the Logic which we Know, but the Logic which we know is determined by the logical function through that Word - Matrix, which could have been called anyway else not only the Word - Matrix, Logic, and, it would have had, the same effect within the Knowledge and only within the Knowledge where the Primordial Event determined by the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite initiated the Phenomenon and, therefore the Cause and Effect.

Without the Phenomenon and the Event we can in no way talk about Cause and Effect!

As we have already written, each Word - Matrix due to the conjunctive function determined by the Analogy of Everything has as, its characteristics all the Expressions of the other Words - Matrices within the infinity of Words-Matrices of the Universal Pure Language.

What makes them different from each other is how these Words - Matrices are reflected among them, in the sense that no Word -Matrix will not reflect or will be found according to the Analogy of Everything in the other Words - Matrices, just as another Word -Matrix is found, because a single own Symbol of their is enough, which differs them

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

from the others, and on which receives him once with his determination, that all his reportings at the infinity of Words- Matrices within the Universal Pure Language to be different from all other Words- Matrices, which gives them the uniqueness within the diversity, but also the different Expressions of each in part within the Universal Pure Language.

The logical function being determined, from the level of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, means that it will be the same as and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness compared to Words -Matrices, in the sense that it will not be within them, as is the conjunctive function given by the "Infinite Continuum" or the function of the Analogy of Everything, but will be reported to these Words -Matrices from "exterior".

We put the quotation marks because does not exist in the present case either exterior or interior than in the figurative way.

The logical function being and a reporting function.

thus, the Word -Matrix, of the Logic was determined through its characteristics to pass through the group of Words- Matrices, attributive and disjunctive, as eventually, to reach at Knowledge for to determine the parallelism toward its Mirror, due to the logical function on which possesses it, and which determined the Word -Matrix, Logic, to be precisely the essence of all Words-Matrices, through which "passes", starting with the End, the Beginning, the Origin, the Creation, in which the Unique and the Happening are always found on disjunctive functional bases to eventually reach Knowledge.

No matter how odd it would seem, the Word -Matrix, Logic, is the one that becomes the ESSENCE of all these Words -Matrices.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, the essence is a parallelism through which each Word -Matrix (when we talk about Words-Matrices, we talk and about their Expressions), is reported to self or the characteristics of the Word -Matrix are reported to self, becoming parallel to the characteristics of another Word -Matrix determined by the logical function, parallelism which determines the essence of both Words-Matrices, from the equation.

Why?

Because each Word -Matrix will be reflected in the other and as a result of this reflection, the result will be the image of the essence of each Word -Matrix in the other.

Thus, the Image of the essence of Knowledge will be found in Logic and the Image of the Essence of Logic will be found in Knowledge, and if we want to know which is the essence of Logic or Knowledge, we will only have to reverse the Images of the essence and assign them each time to the other Word -Matrix, which will lead to a different Expression.

However, the Image will never be real with the thing itself, it will always be a virtual Expression if not even totally unreal, not to mention that we humans and so are limited in thinking, by the Illusion of Life and the Logical Coefficient 2.

However, we can make us an impression of what the essence of Logic or Knowledge could mean with the help of inversion.

Does the parallelism of logic function in turn determine a Mirror for each Word-Matrix in part as in the case of Knowledge?

Not! And I want, to you NOT make this mistake never.

In the case of Knowledge, parallelism consists in the Mirror because Knowledge itself is determined through and in the Semantics Mirror of the Infinite, while other

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Words-Matrices, even and from the attributive or disjunctive group, will not require a parallelism in the Mirror, but in completely different ways.

For example, if we take the Word - Matrix, End, in this Word - Matrix, the the Word -Matrix, Logic, will be in parallelism, respective in its essence, as being its Beginning, because only the Beginning can be parallel to the End, fact that will truly determine the occurrence of the Word -Matrix, with Symbol, of Beginning, in this scheme of the attributive group.

For the Word- Matrix, Beginning, parallelism will consist in End, and once with it the third Word - Matrix will intervene: the Origin, whose parallelism consists both in the Beginning and the End what will determine the fourth Word - Matrix: the Creation, whose parallelism consists in Beginning, End, and Origin, to eventually we get to Knowledge, where the parallelism of Knowledge consists in Beginning, End, Origin, and Creation, and all these will be attributed to Logic, because Knowledge will be defined through the Semantic Mirror of Infinity, about which I have written so many times.

Thus, the Logic will have as defining, the four Words-Matrices or, more correctly said, the four Expressions of these Words-Matrices, in which, in fact, the essence of Knowledge consists.

Why?

Due parallelism, which I was just talking about, namely, the Image of Logic is actually the essence of Knowledge and vice versa the Image of Knowledge is actually the essence of Logic.

Thus, the essence of Logic will consist in the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite!

Between the Word- Matrix, Logic, the Logical Function and Logic within the Word- Matrix of Knowledge is a great difference.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, the main features of Logical Function are: Parallelism and functional cumulation, which defines logical function as being the one what determines the essence of Words -Matrices or of Expressions where this one is present.

I have talked about the importance of parallelism, but and of the cumulation of functions, on which I consider them as being the most valuable characteristics of a function, because on the basis of parallelism and of the cumulation of functions it is possible to determine the basic principles of the Logical Function what become implicitly the basic principles of Coaxiological Logic.

The Coaxiological Logic is a new Logic that combines Classical Logic (Aristotelian), Mathematical Logic, of the logical functors, the Dialectical Logic, respectively the dialectics of the notion, judgment and reasoning, the Common Element from my philosophy is at the basis of Syllogism, the Constructivist Logic, where the Infinite is the same as me in the course, of eternal construction, which can be found in the "Infinite Continuum", Logic of Relations and Modal Logic.

All these types of Logic are merged within the Coaxiological Logic, and besides these are also included other possibilities of Coaxiological Logic, which **surpasses** them, but and **unites** them, at the same time on these.

Until we come to a more detailed deployment of these types of Logics reported to the Coaxiological Logic and finally included in it, we will first have to define the Coaxiological Logic.

In order to give it a definition, we will need to know on what principles Coaxiological Logic focuses and only so we will be able to define it.

*Again, in order to define the principles of Coaxiological Logic, we must first establish the characterological status of this Logic, which is focused on*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*the Logical Function, the one that underlies the entire Coaxiological Logic, namely, Parallelism and Functional Cumulation.*

*Thus, the Principles of the Coaxiological Logic are and the Principles of Logical Function.*

Again attention, I repeat, the Logical Function is not the Word - Matrix, Logic and nor the Logic within the Word - Matrix of the Knowledge.

Through Parallelism that starts from reporting the Unique Expression of Pure Universal Consciousness into the Pure Universal Language, and vice versa, of the Language in the Unique Expression, it means that this Parallelism is responsible for defining the Universal Pure Language versus the Unique Expression of Pure Universal Consciousness, and of this one, in its turn, for the definition as against the Universal Pure Language.

I have also written that the Universal Pure Language with its Expressions and Words, with an infinite number, is determined "Continuously" by the "Infinite Continuum," and thus the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is not reported only to the Universal Pure Language but also to the "Infinite Continuum" through the Logical Function.

Thus, one of the first principles of the Logical Function would be the one of reporting, due precisely to the characteristic of Parallelism of this function, as and on, the quality of cumulation of other functions within this Function that determines the essence of the Everything and All.

**Reporting and Parallelism at the same time are precursors to the Absolute Truth, but also to a new type of Truth, namely the Coaxiological Truth determined directly and only by the Logical Function, because through reporting it is possible to determine the veracity**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

of one or the other, who participate within the respective relation.

This veracity is that which determines the Absolute Truth only and only within the Word -Matrix, of the Knowledge, followed by the Neonotional, Notional Truths, or other and other, Relative Truths within the Illusion of Life, but again great attention, all this happens only and only in the worlds of the Word -Matrix, of the Knowledge.

The parallelism of Logical Function is the one that will determine the equivalent of the Truth at each Word - Matrix in part, equivalent that will not be an Absolute Truth of that Word - Matrix, and no Truth from the perspective of that Word, but only and only from the perspective of Knowledge, thus, the Coaxiological Truth can be called Truth only from the perspective of Knowledge, but NOT and from the perspective of other Word - Matrices within the Universal Pure Language, where the Coaxiological Truth can bear totally different names, but also, to receive different Symbols from case to case.

Yet at the base of any Truth lies the reporting, and, thus, the Coaxiological Truth is a Truth not only Relative, because it is in function of reporting, but above all is also a Neosemiotic Truth, because is depending on each Word -Matrix in part, depending from case to case if its Symbol will show in some way or otherwise, but, anyway, is no longer synonymous with truth, only, if he was looking through Knowledge, this one would be a Truth.

As for the Neosemiotics I have discussed the subject extensively in "Antichrist, Being and Love".

The same Parallelism of the Logical Function will also determine, and another quality of the Coaxiological Truth, namely of to be denied, always by the "Infinite

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Continuum" and of to be always substituted with its own self, through the Truth from behind the Truth, as well as Everything from behind the Everything, thus being a Substituent Truth.*

*Alongside the substituent quality of the Coaxiological Truth, the Motivating quality also intervenes, that of to always be a motivation for another Truth on which ultimately can relativize him or not, only the Motivating quality of the Coaxiological Truth is that which self-determines two or more opposite or analogous poles.*

*The Complementary quality is due to the feature of functional cumulation of Logical Function, through which this Function becomes eternal the essence of Everything, and this essence will be complementary to the elements whose essence is.*

*Thus, the Coaxiological Truth is a Relative, Neosemotic, Substituent, Motivating, and Complementary Truth.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## **CHAPTER II**

### **The Intangible Forms**

Regarding parallelism, it is noticed where he can lead and what new possibilities he can develop about what Coaxiological Logic defines, which becomes precisely due to parallelism a Logic of the Coaxiological Truth, Truth which gives this Logic, respectively Logical Function certain principles of its, after which the entire Logical Function is guided.

Even from the point of view of the name, the Word "function" implies a "something" which defines itself, as, determining another "something".

Thus, from the point of view of Knowledge, the function is "something" that does "something", so it fulfills a certain task.

To fulfil a task is equivalent, with, to Create?

No matter how odd it would seem, but from the point of view of Knowledge, everything that fulfills "something" Creates.

Does this fact mean that the Logical Function also Creates?

From what I have written so far, Creation appears only in quality of Word -Matrix which belongs in our vision to the group of the five, namely, the End, the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Beginning, the Origin, the Creation, which in turn determines Knowledge.

It is precisely this, that makes Creation to appear as an appanage of the Logical Function, so of the Coaxiological Logic in its naming, what is false because it is due to the way through which we look at this Logical Function, namely through the Knowledge, which is determined by Creation.

Thus, it is no less true that a function "creates".

I think the most appropriate term would be, that a function defines.

But, through definition, does not it create?

It is possible, but only if the Knowledge intervenes in the equation.

The origin of parallelism is in the Asymptotic Function of the "Infinite Continuum", where the two lines tend, at infinity, towards each other, but without ever being able to unite.

*Perhaps the biggest question in the whole Coaxialism, is what would have been if the Asymptotic Function did NOT exist or if the Asymptotic Function is really asymptotic?*

*Personally, I do NOT believe in the Asymptotic Function as it is revealed to us, being the adept of the fact that the two lines become tangent to infinity.*

With what the Asymptotic Function should have been replaced and how would have shown the development model of the Universal Pure Language, but of the Universal Pure Consciousness and of the "Infinite Continuum"?

Would have been the parallelism, the one underlying the Coaxiological Logic, respectively at the basis of the Logical Function, whose characteristics consist precisely to determine the parallelism?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Because the Logical Function is defined above all through its characteristics and its most important feature is precisely to determine the parallelism.

How would have been the worlds of Knowledge without parallelism?

I have stressed several times so far the fact that the two lines from the Asymptotic Function would have been five, if the Logical Coefficient on the basis of which they were thought rationally, it would have been five, on the basis of which they were thought rationally, it would have been five, or would have been an infinite number of straight lines which tend, some toward the others, if the Logical Coefficient with which the Asymptotic Function is reasoned would be infinite.

This determines us to realize the following reasoning: the Asymptotic Function only occurs according to the Logical Coefficient, and if it is infinite, and the number of straight lines that tend towards each other is infinite, which means that all the lines that tend to a center where they would become tangent, therefore, to unite, they can be represented by points, and the points are arranged around that center where, the lines which become tangent with points, this time, they tend, toward the center.

The infinity of those points determines a circle and the center of the circle determines the center toward which the straight lines tend, for to become tangent between them without being able to do so due to the Asymptotic Function.

Thus, at an infinite reasoning, the Asymptotic Function becomes represented by a circle that has a center inside it.

The fact that the lines tend towards that center, but being an infinity of straight lines, which, each is a point of the circumference of the circle, means that each such straight line is tangent with the other through the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

circumference of the circle, and the circle becomes, in turn, the point of connection where and the two lines from the case of the Logical Coefficient 2 will unite.

**Thus the Asymptotic Function is NOT real than in the Illusion of our Life, and the parallelism is given precisely by the infinite parallelisms of the straight lines which unite through the circumference of the infinite circle.**

The true Asymptotic Function is this, but at the particular level it can be determined through the Logical Coefficient 2 and as two straight lines which tend, some toward the others, without ever being able to unite, because in order to achieve the union, the infinity is needed.

This means that, if the lines which tend, some toward the others, have an infinite number, and they become, a point of circumference of the circle, because they tend towards a common center, and the circle is defined as an infinity of points around a center, it means that the "Infinite Continuum" is no longer "Continuous"?

If the two lines unite in the Asymptotic Function, I wonder if and this function, anymore is Asymptotic Function ?

No matter how difficult my response might seem for some or interesting for others, I would like to point out that the "Infinite Continuum" remains the same "Continuous" even if the straight lines unite at infinity, becoming tangent through the circumference of the circle, and the Asymptotic Function remains that Asymptotic Function, because it is always flanked in the domain of its determinations by the landmark of Negation, which is, in fact, the Circle with the infinity of lines which become tangent to each other.

Thus, the Asymptotic Function becomes the Diversity, and the Circle where the Infinite determines the tangent of the lines which tend, some toward the others, is

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

the Uniqueness, as eventually Asymptotic Function (the Diversity), canceled by the landmark of Negation (the Uniqueness), determines Structuralization precisely by canceling the Diversity by the Uniqueness, what confers to this annulment the structural status of Not being Diversity, because it is Unity, thus the Structure receives its System, in which it integrates.

All this determine the Undefinition, so that again it reaches the Asymptotic Function, which will be again eternally canceled by, the landmark of Negation, because the Infinite is always an All, and this All becomes the first step from the Finite!

Those who are total followers of the Asymptotic Function, they are wrong when they claim that two straight lines do not unite, so they are not tangent, because they are tangent to infinity, but they are not tangent only if we reason them through the prism of a Logical Coefficient less than Infinite.

Once these are tangent, it is clear that the Asymptotic Function can NOT exist than as a particularity of a certain Logical Coefficient, a particularity that is also found in the mathematics of our world, which profoundly mistakes when considering certain theorems or axioms as being true, because they should be interpreted conjectural, depending on the Logical Coefficient, on the basis of which they are rationalized and thus a new discipline will be born, namely Conjunctural Coaxiological Mathematics.

Thus, if the first principle of Logical Function consists in to determine parallelism by its characteristics but also the cumulation of other functions, on which has essentialized them, becoming implicitly their essence, means that the Logical Function is determined by the characteristics of the "Infinite Continuum", respectively, the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, Structuralization and Undefinition.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

These characteristics are the ones which determine the first principle after which will be guided the Logical Function, namely the parallelism and the cumulation of functions, which it will essentialize, becoming always and eternally their essence.

How namely the cumulation of functions?

The Logical Function has the ability to subordinate all the other functions that are developing within the Words - Matrices of the Universal Pure Language and, once with this subordination, the Logical Function becomes the essence of each such function in part and not the common essence of them.

This means that the Logical Function is defined as the essence of a certain function, in the quality on which it has the respective function compared to the Logical Function, so depending on the respective function and, of course, and depending on the Logical Function.

Thus, the report between the Logical Function and the Attributive Function will be other than the report between the Logical Function and the Disjunctive Function what will determine two different essences, therefore the essence of the Attributive Function will be different from the essence of the Disjunctive Function.

Parallelism is determined due the fact that, the characteristics become principles and the principles become characteristics.

Thus the Asymptotic Function automatically becomes from the characteristic of the "Infinite Continuum", the principle of the "Infinite Continuum," the same as and Negation of the Negation, the Structuring and Undefinition.

All these Principles-Characteristics are linked to each other precisely through their final result, which is the "Infinite Continuum," and none could be without the other,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

because the lack of one such characteristic would implicitly lead to the total annulment of the others.

The sum of these characteristics consists of the "Infinite Continuum" which becomes their Principle, as well as each characteristic in part, is and a principle in part, which means that the sum of these principles consists of a single Principle-Characteristic that is the "Infinite Continuum."

This justifies us believing that besides, the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, Structuralization, and Undefinition, could be and other possible Principles-Characteristics which, through a connection such as that of the above four mentioned, to give other Principles-Characteristics, such as the "Infinite Continuum" but about which we know absolutely nothing.

So and it is, alongside the "Infinite Continuum," there are other groupings that determine such Characteristics -Principles, where each in part is a Characteristic - Principle, fact which determines us to admit the existence of other forms not only of "Infinite Continuum", but also of representations that underlie Everything but which are totally inaccessible to us, not emphasized within the Knowledge and nor within the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, because these groupings will no longer determine Words-Matrices of the Universal Pure Language, which have as root, the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, Structuralization and Undefinition, but other and other different forms, of everything I have described so far within the Coaxiology, which I now call them as being Intangible Forms.

Thus, within these **Intangible Forms** intervene other and other Characteristics -Principles, different from the four underlying the "Infinite Continuum" and which are the precursors of the Logical Function, but again great

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

attention, NOT and the Characteristics -Principles of the Logical Function.

Why are not implicitly, and the characteristics - principles of this Logical Function?

The answer lies in the fact that at the definition of the Logical Function intervenes the "Infinite Continuum" in quality of part which is reported at the Unique Expression of Pure Universal Consciousness, reporting that denotes a parallelism to it.

This means that in equation the characteristics - Principles of the "Infinite Continuum" are not taken, but only the "Infinite Continuum" as the Whole.

Instead, the parallelism determined then, compared to the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is the one that "triggers" the determination of the Logical Function.

Thus, by parallelism, Logical Function receives a characteristic that becomes implicitly and its principle, because any characteristic becomes parallel to a certain principle, because the characteristic replaces the principle which it defines precisely through parallelism.

Why parallel to a certain principle and not perpendicular or horizontal for example?

The answer consists in the fact that the principle defines a characteristic while the characteristic defines a principle and there where will be a characteristic will always be a principle.

The difference between characteristic and principle consists only and only in the reporting to the Everything represented by the sum of characteristics, which becomes a principle that in turn will be a certain characteristic.

When I say about the Principles of Coaxiology that they are so, and so, I implicitly focus mainly on the characteristics of Coaxiology which become thus implicitly principles, of its.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

We will never be able to determine structures that are the characteristics, without systems that are the principles.

Thus, the characteristic-principle relation is equivalent to the structure-system relation, and from this the parallelism intervenes as such, in the sense that the structure will define eternally the system, while the system in its turn will define eternally the structure.

Returning to the "Infinite Continuum" and its four basic characteristics, we observe that these are a structural part of the "Infinite Continuum" which is the systemic part of these characteristics, which entitles us to accede to the fact that any characteristic determines a parallelism with its own its system, which is the principle to which it is subordinated, which in turn will become a characteristic reported to another principle.

This "passing" from characteristic to principle and from principle to characteristic, determines an interrelation between the two under the aspect of system -structure and structuralization -systematization, which proves the parallelism that determines the Logical Function, by its first principle-characteristic, which is the parallelism.

This parallelism is responsible for the functional cumulation posterior to it, fact which will propel the Logical Function as being an eternal "kernel" of the functions which will develop "in time" between the Words-Matrices of the Universal Pure Language, and this quality of "kernel" will be the one through which the Logical Function will always be the essence of these functions.

What namely, has determined the characteristics, which grouped will become principles, what will be defined, in turn, as being the characteristics of other principles?

Why was the Asymptotic Function necessary and what it would have been without it, I just wrote, but what

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

namely has determined it as an Asymptotic Function and only to appear in our representation, and not otherwise, I will demonstrate it now.

I have just defined the Intangible Forms, which are principles whose characteristics are different from those of the "Infinite Continuum," but which are and lies somewhere there, determining new and new structuralizations and systematizations about which we do not Know anything, being impossible for us, to reach even with our mind at such a level, because it is systemically structured totally differently from the "Infinite Continuum" and its four characteristics.

What does this thing mean?

First of all, that there, no longer intervenes, under, no possible or impossible form, of the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, the Structuralization and the Nedefinition, fact which even leads to the lack of the structuring, thus implicitly, and the systematization of certain principles.

However, even through their lack, respectively of the system and the structure, new systems and structures can be defined, because if you remember the Lack from the Semantic and Neosemantic which favors the Periodic, precisely this Lack is the one which highlights that becoming.

Thus and in this case, even if we are infinitely further from that place, and, intervenes another kind of Lack, even this Lack by its definition can determine a system and a structure of the Lack in self, which leads us to other and other, possible structuring, of type, characteristics-principles, beyond the Asymptotic Function, fact which entitles us to believe that precisely these determine even the Asymptotic Function, what again means that the Asymptotic Function in reality is not Asyptotic at all, because the two straight lines become tangent not only

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

to the infinite level within the circumference of the same circle, but above all they become tangent at the level of the Intangible Forms, because these actually determine the Asymptotic Function, and whatever has a determinant becomes a determined even if at an infinite level, and whatever becomes determined is found in its own determinant, which gives it inclusion within the determinant, and thus, the Asymptotic Function in reality, is not so asymptotic as it seems, but rather uses asymptotism as a characteristic of its, and, in no way as an inner essence of its, I repeat, even if all this is happening, reported in and through the infinite.

Thus, the "Infinite Continuum" becomes in turn, a determinant that has as its determinant, the Intangible Forms, where besides the characteristics -principles, the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, the Structuralization and the Undefinition are also other groupings of such characteristics, and the Coaxiological Logic, therefore, the Logical Function, in particular, will have to take these into account in its later developments.

Thus, the Asymptotic Function has the asymptotism only in quality, of particular characteristic and only through highlighting it at the "Infinite Continuum", because the Asymptotic Function, in fact, is not at all asymptotic, but has totally other and other determinations on which the Coaxiological Logic will necessarily have to take them into consideration.

From the point of view of the Intangible Forms, the Asymptotic Function will have other characteristics-principles, perhaps, being even like the "Infinite Continuum" which has in its structuralization a number of basic characteristics, such as the four within the "Infinite Continuum" and where one of them is even the Asymptotic Function?

I strongly believe in this.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Therefore, the "Infinite Continuum" includes within it other and other principles within each characteristics of its.

The Asymptotic Function becomes asymptotic only reported to the "Infinite Continuum" such as the landmark of Negation, Structuralization and Undefinition, are thus emphasized only reported to the "Infinite Continuum" and in no way to their quintessence, to what mean they themselves reported to other and other landmarks that are, in this case, the Intangible Forms.

The "Infinite Continuum" becomes one from the infinity lost within the Intangible Forms?

Thus, he would NOT be "Infinite Continuum" but would always be one of these Intangible Forms, remaining finite?

No matter how strange seems to be, this answer lies in the fact that all these Intangible Forms can not be called as being infinite or being in an infinite number, precisely because they are not defined, neither by their infinity and nor by their number, to find out if they are in a finite or infinite number or if they are infinite.

These Intangible Forms define absolutely anything other than the "Infinite Continuum" which, by the phrase "Continuously", defines precisely the Finite that tends eternally toward the Infinite.

The Intangible Forms are forms whose possible meanings consist precisely in their non-sense, because they do not possess, neither Symbol, and much less the Meaning, which propels them outside of any of its own systematizations of any known Logic.

Intangible forms can not be defined, neither as being structures or principles that include structures, because they are their Lack, as they can not be defined nor as being characteristics-principles in the sense known by us, because they are not defined through any sense because

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

they are exterior to the "Infinite Continuum", and even if they are exterior, this does not mean that would be outside of "Infinite Continuum" and the area covered by the "Infinite Continuum", precisely because they have nothing to do with the "Infinite Continuum".

It's like saying, "Reactor and Fur." What is the connection in the expression, "Fur Reactor" ?

Certainly none, just to the extent that a certain animal with fur would fly in a plane with reaction, which means that to make a connection would intervene and other Words.

In this case, not even these Words, can no longer intervene, which means that between the "Infinite Continuum" and the Intangible Forms can not be established links between their Expressions.

Therefore, the "Infinite Continuum" is completely broken by Intangible Forms, and between these and the "Infinite Continuum" there can be no relations from the point of view of their characteristics and principles, because they are as different as possible Symbol or Meaning that they have no tangency with each other.

Consequently, the "Infinite Continuum" with the Pure Universal Language and the Unique Expression of Pure Universal Consciousness have not any connection with the Intangible Forms, than that of indirect determination.

Through relating of indirect determination, it is understood the fact that despite the non-existence of some relations of the order of the common characteristics or principles, they are established only by determining other characteristics and principles, foreign of determinant, as is the case of the Asymptotic Function, which for the Intangible Form that possesses it and determines this Asymptotic Function for us has a completely different, Symbol, Meaning, Sense, but also Characteristic and

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Principle, with what the Asymptotic Function means, for us.

This is the Inversion of the Intangible Form, on the basis of which is defined the Asymptotic Function and the asymptotism in general that generates, the landmark of the Negation, the Structuralization and the Undefinition, within the system of the "Infinite Continuum".

How Intangible Forms are groupings different from the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of the Negation, the Structuralization and the Undefinition, means that, and their functional result will also be different, so if the four define the "Infinite Continuum", Intangible Forms will define altogether other and other possible "representations" than the "Infinite Continuum".

I put it in quotation marks because everything that is part from Everything is a representation and can be determined starting with the "Infinite Continuum", whereas what is no longer part of the All can no longer be called representation, so the term in the quotes is figurative.

What are the Intangible Forms in this case?

If they are not part of the All, but they are not, nor representations, in our understanding of what may mean a representation, respectively, a landmark that is part of the All, and only from All, never from outside of Everything, because then is no longer representation, then what namely are Intangible Forms?

Could these be located in the Back of Everything, about which I have spoken so often in my books so far?

They can not be located neither behind the Everything, because in this Back of the Everything, exists the "Infinite Continuum", which is implicitly defined and through the Back of Everything, the Back of the Everything through which "Infinite Continuum" remains eternal "Continuously", because this Back of the Everything is the inverse that defines the contradiction of continuity of the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

"Infinite Continuum", this Back of Everything is either the Finite from the Infinite, or the Infinite from the Finite, or the Endlessness from the Infinite, or the Terminated part of the Endlessness from the Infinite, thus, Everything has always a Back of its.

Accordingly, Intangible Forms are groupings of other determinations (different) from, the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of the Negation, the Structuralization and, the Undefinition, but which are not part of Everything from the Back of Everything, and nor from Everything, they are not landmarks or Forms in themselves, being defined by me as Forms, because within my language of terrestrial being, I find no other word more suitable for these pseudoforms.

Then how can they be groupings? The question that arises and refers to groupings is complicated because a grouping involves a lot of "something".

Only here we see that these, though they can not be landmarks, are crowds of "something," but, that "something" is totally undefined by us because it is outside the asymptotism of the Asymptotic Function and of the landmark of the Negation, of the Structuralization and Undefinition, and this outside is the only clue which can bind us to the Intangible Forms, an indication which, on the other hand, can not even reassure us, that always what is outside compared with inside is that "something", because the word outside, in this case, has a completely different meaning, not being, nor even Everything from the Back of Everything, and no other possible representation of these All, but it is defined, as not being, neither Everything and nor Everything from Back of Everything, but which is there, although it is not part of these, not causing harm under any form the Everything, because it does not exist as a landmark for it.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

However, then Intangible Forms are not a different kind of All, based entirely on other precepts involving other and other considerations which may be the subject of the reconsideration, implicitly of the Analogy of Everything about which I have written.

My answer is No, because as I have pointed out before, these Intangible Forms have nothing to do with the notion of Landmark, or of anything else that would be part in some way or another from the "Infinite Continuum", which implies a total detachment from Everything, even though we in our reasoning will can not admit "something" that is not part of Everything, and nor from Everything from Back of Everything, fact which is opposed to reasoning and judgment, but which must be accepted as such because the Truth used by our judgment is not only not the Absolute Truth of Knowledge, but this judgment is so often overshadowed by all sorts of precepts or considerations, harmful logic which determine false truths about ourselves.

One of these false truths is also the fact that we have the Illusion of Life, that we Know the Truth, although a ray of light exists even at level of Illusion of the Life where the Truth is Relative, so implicitly intervenes the relativity of the truth, being conjectural depending on our own Logical Coefficient 2, where intervene the Good and Evil, true and false etc., which determine the relativity of truth subjected to the Illusion of Life.

Even the notion of relativity in spite of the fact that it is not known in itself, intrinsically, suggests something, namely the fact that we humans despite the fact that we live a false life, we are partly aware of the falsity of this life through the notion of relativity that we can associate with the Truth, Notion which determines us to judge not only after the notions on which the landmarks have them, but, also, according to the notions on which it can possesses,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

and other possible or even impossible landmarks that would be situated, from point of view Logical but also Analogical, within the relativity between true and false.

Thus, human truth is a relative truth that is determined as being a "Continuum" between good and evil, true and false.

All of this justifies us to accept the relativisation, and within the present example, on the Intangible Forms as not being the Landmarks of the "Infinite Continuum," and everything that is not a Landmark, is not, nothing, and yet it is "something."

Therefore, the relativisation of that "something" implies a "something" relative depending on "Infinite Continuum", or "something" defined through the Intangible Forms as not being relative to "Infinite Continuum," but in this case being other Forms?

If we use the term Forms, it automatically includes the Landmark and is canceled by itself.

What namely can be or may not be relative to the "Infinite Continuum" which is a continuous source of the Contradiction determined starting with the asymptotism of the Asymptotic Function, the Landmark of Negation, the Structuralization and the Undefinition?

All this has been determined before by that "something" that may be or may not be relative to the "Infinite Continuum", relatively from our point of view of people, or from the intrinsic point of view of that "something" defined by me as being Intangible Forms? Yes!

Because all of this is relative both from our point of view of people, supporters of the Relative Truth and from the point of view of the Intangible Forms that are relativized precisely by the relativity of the "Infinite Continuum" which is the source of the Contradiction, and no one, can not deny the relativisation of the Contradiction.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Any Contradiction is Relative, as how any Relativization, determines the Contradiction.

We can not talk about Contradiction without reminding Relativization, because no Contradiction, is not composed of an element which to be totally, and independently accepted as self, within the respective equation, but always includes two or more elements between which inherent relativisations intervene due precisely to the Contradiction between them based on their differentiation.

Thus, Contradiction will always be relative due of the difference which consists between the elements that define or compose it.

In the case of the "Infinite Continuum", respectively of the asymptotism from its base, relativisation intervenes precisely through the denial of asymptotism by Negation of Negation, which defines the fact that and Intangible Forms possess a relativism precisely through their interference within the "Infinite Continuum" through asymptotism of Asymptotic Function?

The question also becomes a response in the case when any relativisation must be determined by another relativisation.

However, we do not know whether asymptotism is the same, that is, all asymptotism, and within Intangible Forms that are not actually Forms, but that "something" which can not be defined, not being landmark, and the term "Forms" has been put by me, I repeat, totally and entirely randomly, not having in our language a closer term, that is why it was immediately followed by "Intangible", which represents a relative trend, toward what these are in fact, which represents a "something", but without being a Landmark, and nor other structure, but which nevertheless has the capacity to determine asymptotism within the "Infinite Continuum", asymptotism that underlies the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

miraculous but also diabolical construction of this "Infinite Continuum", where, in her turn, is and our world.

Returning to the first principle of Logical Function, namely to parallelism and the quality of essentialization, we observe that the premises of this parallelism consist precisely in the relativization of the Intangible Forms which interpose through asymptotism at the "Infinite Continuum", asymptotism which thus ensures the reporting of these Intangible Forms over the "Infinite Continuum, which for us represents the Everything, but and the Everything from behind the Everything.

It would never have existed Everything from behind the Everything, and nor the Everything for to determine the Contradiction if it were not the Intangible Forms which to determine the Asymptotism, by means of which, this model to be able to group and, more than that, to be able to be perceived in quality of a Landmark on a relativistic basis and in no way on defined and frozen structures as being self-contained.

In this case, we must also return and upon the Universal Pure Language and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, and establish whether they are relative or self-contained, whether a Word -Matrix is relative, or whether that Word -Matrix implicitly with the Expression it represents, is relative.

My answer lies in relativity without any equivoque, because each Word -Matrix has a certain Expression, only reported to a particular Word -Matrix, and if it is reported to another Word -Matrix it no longer has the same Expression and for the other Word -Matrix, which determines the relativization of the Words-Matrices of Universal Pure Language and implicitly once with this relativization also determines the relativization of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

How can an Unique Expression be relativized?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The answer lies in the fact that this Unique Expression is Unique for each Word -Matrix, but also for the whole Universal Pure Language, whose Expressions report to the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

Thus, the relativity of Universal Pure Language will also prove the relativity of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness through its reporting to the Expressions of each Word -Matrix in part, but also through its reporting to a single Expression of Universal Pure Language as a sum of all Words -Matrices, an Expression that is always in a change, transformation, according to the "Infinite Continuum", which eternally and infinitely determines new and new Words-Matrices through its "Continuing" tendency towards Infinity, which will always change the Expression of the Whole Universal Pure Language, but also the Expressions of the Words -Matrices, because each Word -Matrix has its own Expression in its relation to another Word -Matrix.

If within the Universal Pure Language appear new and new Words-Matrices at Infinity, this fact means that new and new Expressions appear at Infinity, so, and new reportings at Infinity, of the Words-Matrices, preexisting, compared to newcomers, fact which will change the way of approach and of the pre-existing ones, compared to the preexisting ones, which already had a certain established approach, because their Expressions are constantly changing, so that for a certain Word -Matrix which up to that point had a certain Expression compared to another Word -Matrix, that Expression will change, because it changes and the reporting of the Words- Matrices to the Universal Pure Language, which is in continuous expansion.

What would happen if the Universal Pure Language would not be in this expansion?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The answer is simple, namely it would no longer be "Infinite Continuum," it would no longer have tendency toward anything, but would become stable and frozen, the contradiction would disappear, and once with it and the relativism between the reportings.

If the relativism between reportings disappears, the reportings would disappear implicitly, because they would no longer have the object of their identity, which consists precisely in the reporting.

Why? Because any reporting consists in relativization, because at least two distinct elements intervene, namely the rapporteur and the rapportant (ie, the landmark of the reporting), which determines, as I have already said, the inherent contradiction of reporting, so the relativization.

Thus, everything we know for sure about Intangible Forms (sure, it exists only from our point of view) is the fact that it determines the asymptotism and, once with it, becomes that "something", which implies within our Logic the relativization that underlies the parallelism, defined through the implication of at least two elements within of an equation for these to be parallel, but from the point of view of reasoning, this parallelism includes contradiction and, of course, relativisation.

Thus, the first principle of the Logical Function includes within it, through parallelism, the relativization and contradiction.

The relativization and contradiction could be the premises of the essentialization of the Logical Function, ie, those premises through which the Logical Function to always become the essence of Everything, but also of Everything from Behind Everything, respectively, the essence of the Words-Matrices, but and of the Functions that can be developed within these Words-Matrices?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Or is it possible to become just the essence of some or other from the proper equation?

My answer lies in the fact that the Logical Function make essentials not only the Words -Matrices, but also all other Functions developed between these Words -Matrices or within these Words -Matrices, because its parallelism includes precisely relativisation and contradiction and once with these and the relations between two or more elements which relate to each other and socializing themselves, and once with this socialization they become essentials precisely through parallelism and the inherent contradictions what determine their own relativism and of the "Infinite Continuum", thus the Logical Function becomes essence for Everything but and for All within the "Infinite Continuum", being in fact the Function determined by the "Infinite Continuum" to the Asymptotic Function determined by the Intangible Forms.

Once it becomes the essence of Everything in All and of the All in Everything, it means that the Logical Function is not only a function but and an essence?

What is the difference between Function and essence, but between Logic and essence?

Within the "Infinite Continuum", the Logical Function becomes essence, which means that the essence consists in the Logic of this Function, therefore the essence becomes an attribute of Logic.

However, the question which is put again, if the essence is not a Logical Function but an essence, or the Logical Function is essence?

My answer is unambiguous: **the Logical Function has the characteristic of being the Essence of all within the "Infinite Continuum"**, because the Logic make essential Everything, but and Everything from Behind Everything, through the contradiction and relativism

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**that determines the parallelism, located as a first aspect within the Logical Function.**

Thus, the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, reported to the Universal Pure Language, respectively to the Expressions of the Words-Matrices of this Language, determines the parallelism which make essential Everything from Behind Everything, but and the Everything, and All are within the "Logical Continuum".

This fact defines the "Logical Continuum" as being intelligent, a "Logical Continuum" whose essence is structured on the Logical Function, so a Logical Continuum of judgment and reasoning, which develops "Continuously" starting from its essence which is the Logical Function, an essence that includes parallelism, respectively once with it, the contradiction and relativization.

Another question would be that related to Truth, namely where is the source of the Coaxiological Truth?

It is certain that it starts from the Intangible Forms because these by the asymptotism that it determines together with relativism and the contradiction defined even and through their own reporting to the "Infinite Continuum" found in the "Logical Continuum", define thus, the Coaxiological Truth, which develops within the "Infinite Continuum" structured within its Logical Function.

Once the Coaxiological Truth becomes structured within the Logical Function means that the Truth is only and only according to the Logical Function, so, of Logic?

Can not exist and Truth without Logic?

But can Logic exist without truth?

My answer is only one, namely, Truth and Logic are **almost** one and the same thing, and Logic without Truth can not exist, as neither Truth without Logic, because any Truth, whether false or true, includes in it Logic for which it is false or true, thus, Logic is united forever with

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

the Truth, and the Coaxiological Logic is united with the Coaxiological Truth.

Moreover, Coaxiological Truth is the Logic, but the Logic is not in its **totality**, the Coaxiological Truth than partially, because parallelism, relativity and contradiction determine the Coaxiological Truth through Intangible Forms and their asymptotism upon the "Infinite Continuum", but to determine does not mean implicitly that they are also reported to this determinant, than to the extent that this determinant intervenes through the Logical Function which has the same determinant as the Coaxiological Truth, to be defined and redefined compared with its contradictory, relative and asymptotic origins.

Thus the contradiction, relativity and asymptotism underlying the "Infinite Continuum" are defined as being between the Intangible Forms and the asymptotism defined through the Coaxiological Truth and the Logical Function, where Coaxiological Truth and Logical Function are the two lines that determine asymptotism through relativization and contradiction, becoming the source of parallelism but implicitly and parallelism becoming their source for the "Infinite Continuum", a source that will cause a re-creation of the Logical Function in the "Infinite Continuum" but also of the Coaxiological Truth within these, totally new and changed in comparison with the Intangible Forms from which they draw their origins, but also in comparison with the "Infinite Continuum", on which determines him, self-determining on them (Logical Function and Coaxiological Truth) as being a new structure with new symbols and meanings, so another Function and another Truth.

Thus the Logical Function is only within the "Infinite Continuum" being the first Function of this determined in some way by this one, but also by the Intangible Forms, in comparison with the Asymptotic Function which is a function that only operates "before" of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

the "Infinite Continuum" becoming one of the main features along with the landmark of Negation, the Structuralization and Undefinition, characteristics that define it by determining it and which do not intervene as its development, as is the case with the Logical Function and the Coaxiological Truth that defines it.

The Logical Function becomes a basic feature of the "Infinite Continuum," because on its basis "Infinite Continuum" is defined both on itself and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness which is NOT a Logical Function, but lies inserted within this due to the fact that the Logical Function is defined immediately after its determination, as being based on the principle of the parallelism and the cumulation of functions, therefore, of the essentialization of these Functions, and through those characteristics that define the Coaxiological Truth what will lead to the development of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, development that could not have taken place had if it had not been this Coaxiological Truth, which, to admit through itself, a self defined also through the Logical Function, the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

On the other hand, this Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness being parallel to "Infinite Continuum" as a suggestion of it, and about suggestion I will return again, it is also parallel due to the Logical Function involving the Coaxiological Truth, what defines from a suggestive point of view if this Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is veridical or not, at least from the point of view of the Logical Coefficient 2 of our world, because on the basis of another Logical Coefficient or of the one Infinite, veracity will no longer be reduced to yes or no, but will be nuanced to the number of the Logical Coefficient or to the Infinity of that reasoning, which will propel the condition of the Coaxiological Truth to that of to

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

define itself from the point of view of its veracity with unique expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

But I ask great attention, the Coaxiological Truth is NOT the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, but totally something else in comparison to it, because the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is reported to this Coaxiological Truth when is reported to the Universal Pure Language, and the Universal Pure Language is also reported to the Coaxiological Truth when is reported at the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, as then they can report directly between them.

Why is it necessary the intervention of this Coaxiological Truth, respectively of the Logical Function which creates him, in order to interpose itself to the reporting of Universal Pure Language and Universal Unique Expression?

The need for interposition consists in the fact that, through Coaxiological Truth, reporting becomes veridical or not, and more than that, through this Coaxiological Truth they define themselves both the Universal Pure Language and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

From the point of view of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness this would not be Unique if the Coaxiological Truth would not define her based on the Infinite Logical Coefficient or of the Logical Function with structuralization, of, Infinite, as being the **UNIQUE** Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, **Uniqueness** that classifies it as such at its definition in comparison to the Universal Pure Language.

On the other hand, the Universal Pure Language would have no relevance if, in turn, it would not be veridical through the Coaxiological Truth versus the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness to which it is always reported.

Thus, at the reporting between the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness and the Universal Pure Language, intervenes the Coaxiological Truth, which is part of the Logical Function.

Therefore, NOT the Logical Function is in the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness or in the Universal Pure Language, but the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness and Universal Pure Language are in their turn determined by the Logical Function through the Coaxiological Truth, on which this one creates him within its, and not the Coaxiological Truth includes the Logical Function as we might be wrong.

In conclusion, the Logical Function includes the Coaxiological Truth which defines in its turn the Universal Pure Language and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, which are totally different from the Logical Function but, which interrelate with it based on the Coaxiological Truth which is included in the Logical Function.

The Universal Pure Language is defined as being a structuralization of the "Infinite Continuum" determined by the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of the Negation, the Structuralization, and Undefinition, all of which define the Universal Pure Language, which all together define the Universal Pure Language, upon which it intervenes the Logical Function with its parallelism and essentialization, for to define him as an Universal Pure Language parallel with Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, on which defines her, same under these aspects of course with the involvement of the Coaxiological Truth.

From what can be seen, the Coaxiological Truth is defined as being the Logical Function, because it is a part of this, but the Logical Function is NOT defined as being

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Coaxiological Truth, because in comparison with the characteristics of the Coaxiological Truth, this one still more possesses the parallelism and the essentialization, through which it always becomes the essence of Everything as and of the Functions developed in this All, but also of Everything from Behind Everything, respectively of the "Infinite Continuum", which propels the "Infinite Continuum" in its quality of Logical element.

Thus, the "Infinite Continuum" is a Logical element based on Logical Function, just as is the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, but, to be an element which **possesses** a certain Logic, does NOT mean at all that the respective element defines the Logic as such!

And we people, we claim that we possess a certain logic of ours in this Illusion of Life, but that does not mean at all that we are the respective logic.

No, by no means, we are not the logic on the basis of which we reason, but, we only consider it to be a helpful tool in our way of to see, reason, judge, but also to understand the world at the same time, even if it is based on the Illusion of Life.

*What would if we, humans, considered logic to be ourselves, and the Illusion of Life does not exist, but all what we see, feel and understand is part of the Absolute Truth of this world?*

This would make that we be able to understand Everything, because our Logic should leave us this aspect once we are the logic, we should know, besides this, why we are NOT and not just why we are, we should also know, why does not exists death because logic never dies, but and why exists life because logic never lives, as finally to we understand why it is possible to do operations of addition, subtraction, division, multiplication, but and others that we do not know, when in their place we could use correlations

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

which to make them coaxial on all these in one logical operation.

*If we humans are, the logic, we should know why are numbers, but also why are not, and more than that, what namely, represent these in reality.*

*If we humans are the logic, we should know why are relations between aspects, phenomena and things and why are not.*

*If we humans are the logic, we should know why we do not know and for what we do not know that we know.*

*If we humans are the logic, we should know why are ways and conditions, but why these are unique or multiple, why are correlations, but and interconnections between them.*

*If we humans are the logic, we should know why we do not know anything to find out everything and why we find out everything to not know anything.*

*If we humans are the logic, we should understand why we do not understand each other, and to not understand us because we understand us, as finally, to we realize that we have nothing to understand.*

*If we humans are the logic, we would not be anything from, in and through us, because the logic is not us, but it, because it is through, in, and out, of itself!*

The Distance up to the Absolute Truth of the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge is enormous, starting from the Intangible Forms, the asymptotism transmitted by these, and everything that develops the characteristics of the "Infinite Continuum" to define its first Function, of its essence, respectively the Logical Function by which the "Infinite Continuum" is defined, a definition which, by the parallelism of the Logical Function defines the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## **CHAPTER III**

### **The Determinations of Logic Function, Tangentiability**

**The third principle of Logical Function is to determine, but and to define through itself, the Coaxiological Truth.**

Regarding this third principle of Logical Function, which involves the determination, but, and definition of this Function by itself of the Coaxiological Truth, it is relevant above all, the determination that is made on certain bases from which I have inserted so far and in this work and others must be developed.

**Interesting is the fact about definition, as being different from determination, because determination means a new result that can in turn establish ratios between other determinants, while the definition consists of a new ratio between the already existing determinants, which radically distinguishes them, on the two ones.**

Thus, I have established so far that the Coaxiological Truth is a Relative Truth, Neosemiotic, Substitutive, Motivating, Complementary, and Analogous Negational.

All these characteristics of the Coaxiological Truth already established are included in their turn, in the modes

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

of determination of this Coaxiological Truth, where each such mode of determination is defined in its turn, by the defining characteristics of the determinations, respectively by those characteristics that support the reportings, or non-reportings of the respective determinations or non-determinations.

Thus, determinants "begin" once with the Logical Function that produces them, self-determining in this way on self, through these, because the Coaxiological Truth is part from the Logical Function.

Once with the determinants appears the Cause and Effect?

Any determinant has a Cause that produces him as any Cause has its own Effect.

To talk about the Cause and Effect in this case is to assign to the Logical Function the quality of Cause, and to the Determinant the quality of Effect.

The Logical Function is not a phenomenon, because it is not, no Event in itself, because I have written so many times in my works, that the Primordial Event can occur only and only in the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge due to the Semantic, the Neosemantic and the Lack, which consists of Periodic, and in this context we are talking about determinants that have a Cause in the Asymptotic Function which is neither an Event and nor a Phenomenon, what surpasses the definition of Cause, that of being the Effect of a certain Phenomenon or Event, etc.

So the question is whether the Logical Function can be a Cause in itself because the Coaxiological Truth is part from self or it is altogether something else, because, how can be determined something from self for self, where, the same you, to be, the Cause, the same you, the Effect, and between these to be and a lot of determinants?

We come to the conclusion-question whether they can be determinants without a Cause of theirs or without an

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Effect, or can they be determinants which to gather within them both Cause and Effect?

If all these are, then how can they be determinants, once what they are determined by the same Cause, which becomes and their Effect?

The same happens and within the Asymptotic Function, which at first glance determines the Landmark of Negation, Structuralization and Undefinition, which are defined as being the "Infinite Continuum" which is found in its first Function, namely the Logical Function which is no longer part of the Intangible Forms.

Thus, the Logical Function can not be determined by the "Infinite Continuum", because this is found as being Logic of this one, being defined, as being, even and "Continuum Infinite" from this point of view precisely because of its parallelisms but also the cumulative quality of essentialization about which I wrote, a quality which defines alongside the "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, making from "Infinite Continuum" a "Logical Continuum" which, thus, brings together both the notion as such of "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness.

Therefore, the Logical Function is NOT determined by the "Infinite Continuum" as an All, even if it can be defined structurally, so reported to the inherent asymptotism, which precedes the Landmark of Negation, for the Structuralization, precisely of the Logical Function, the Structuralization what consists in the Undefinition of the Logical Function, precisely due of the inversion of causality from our point of view, because we can not speak of structural reporting before, therefore predecessor of Structuralization as such.

Thus, the Landmark of Negation has the role of contraversion of this inversion, namely to maintain

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

asymptotism reported to the Logical Function, in spite of the fact that it defines it asymptotically as such, and the Logical Function is structurally defined through asymptotism before to be the Structuralization defined as such within the "Continuum Infinite".

This inversion of causality from the point of our reasoning of Logical Coefficient 2 results in the fact that we can NOT talk about determinism in the true sense of the word at the level of Logical Function, than about an indeterminism whose result consists in a certain determination of the Coaxiological Truth.

This determination of the Coaxiological Truth based on indeterminism is the basis from which the entire structuralization of the "Logical Continuum" will begin, which is one and the same with the "Infinite Continuum", only that within him, also enters alongside this, and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, Unique Expression, that has its basis in the parallelism and cumulative esentialization of Logical Function, but also in determining the Coaxiological Truth based on the indeterminism that I have outlined above.

The ratios between indeterminism and determinism are of several kinds.

These are:

**Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively and Indeterminism - Determined Transcendent.**

**Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively can be in turn Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively of Fund and Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively by Contraversion.**

**The Transcendent Indeterminism can be the Transcendent Indeterminism, Direct, and the Transcendent Indeterminism, Aleatory.**

*Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively of Fund as and the one by Contraversion, is the type of*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

indeterminism that I have just pointed out, namely, *the Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively by Fund* is when the causality is lost in its own effect because the determinant, in this case the Coaxiological Truth, is both the cause of the Logical Function as and its effect, because the Logical Function in this case determines the Coaxiological Truth which is precisely part from the Logical Function, however, the Logical Function determines on itself, only partially.

*Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively by Contraversion* is when asymptotism of the Asymptotic Function reverses causality through the Landmark of Negation concerning the Logical Function defined by reporting, as being a structure defined through its cumulative parallelism, structured on essentialization, reported to asymptotism, and the essentialization is even "before" the Landmark of Negation, through the Logical Function as such, that "begins" immediately after Asymptotic Function, because the Logical Function is identified and with the "Infinite Continuum", apart from its Asymptotic Function, which is in fact an extension of Intangible Forms.

Thus, the Logical Function possesses a structure of its, "before" Structuralization, although Structuralization as such is determined by the Landmark of Negation, what creates the causal inversion by the example: The Structure of Logical Function becomes the cause of the same structure of the same Logical Function with the difference that this is both "before" and "after" the Landmark of Negation, what defines the Structure of this Logical Function by defining the structure of the "Infinite Continuum", an inversion that would deny on itself if it were not precisely the Undefinition, which to denominalize the contraversion of the negation, namely that of to be a structure both "before" and "after" the Landmark of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Negation, that is, the same Effect (the same structure) given by a single cause, which comes from asymptotism, only that the Effect is actually two Effects separated by the landmark of Negation, and thus the first Effect (structure) becomes the cause of the second Effect, which is all structure, even though between these, the landmark of Negation intervenes, in quality of cause of the same Effect.

Thus, the Structure (Effect) of the Logical Function from "before" the Landmark of Negation will be the cause of the second Structure of the Logical Function which is its Effect, only that the same Effect is the same Structure and more than that, the same Structure still has another cause which defines the same Effect, namely the Landmark of Negation.

Thus we will have two different causes having the same Effect, only that one of the causes, respectively the Structure of the Logical Function is the same with its Effect, respectively the same Structure of the Logical Function.

Thus, the two different Causes but with the same Effect will determine the Structure of Logical Function, which will be annulled through the Undefinition of the "Infinite Continuum".

Therefore, can exist two distinct Causes which to determine the same Effect, and one of the two Causes will be precisely the Effect of the two Causes, and thus will determine the causal inversion.

Compared to causal inversion, Undefinition intervenes in the form of contraversion of the causal inversion, because two different Causes can not determine the same Effect, of which one of the Causes being the Effect itself, without to intervene the causal contraversion of the Undefinition, because either one of the Causes is Effect, or remains Cause.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

If it had not intervened the causal Contraversion of the Undefinition, the entire Structure of Logical Function would have collapsed.

All this is due to the implementation of its own principles of Logical Function in order to define itself and redefine, upon the asymptotism due to Intangible Forms.

Thus, Logical Function has one of the most important roles, that actually defines it as such versus asymptotism, namely tangibility.

According to the Logical Function, always the two straight lines, that tend at infinite, one toward another, will unite.

Tangibility becomes one of the basic characteristics of Logical Function, because on the basis of tangibility is defined all the future causal structuralization of this Logical Function, because any tangent becomes a Coaxiological Truth, precisely due to the fact that the tangibility is the basis of modal, conjunctural, random, procedural, linear, operational relations (mathematical operators of the ortho type, gamma, eta, etc.), but also of the causality based on these, including of the determinisms, in which the Coaxiological Truth is carried out as a landmark, source, cause, effect, and its connecting through the reporting to other and other typologies or neotypologies regarding true or untrue functions of the tangential quality.

Tangibility is responsible for determining all the Functions that will develop (is correctly, it develops eternally), not being a beginning or an end, within the Logical Function of the "Logical Continuum".

Consequently, Indeterminism - Determined Cumulatively by Contraversion, is focused on a contraversion of the structuralization based on Undefinition, in order to reach again the initial

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

asymptotism, where the defining again appears as a reporting to the parallelism of the Logical Function, through which is defined the "Infinite Continuum" along with the Universal Unique Expression, within the "Logical Continuum" which is, not only Everything or Everything from behind the Everything, but Everything without Contents or Everything without of Everything, which is the overall Expression of the Logical Function.

All this is realizing only in this way, because as I have already said the Logical Function, but also the "Logical Continuum" can be identified with the asymptotism of Intangible Forms, asymptotism perceived as such by the Logical Function but which can be absolutely anything else.

Thus, it must NOT be done the mistake of to confuse the Logical Function with the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

All these are part of the "Logical Continuum" whose origins are in the asymptotism of the Intangible Forms, asymptotism, that I have said several times so far, is NOT Asymptotism than to the extent of our reporting to this one, but if the respective reports would change, then, and what appears to us, as being defined as asymptotism would be entirely something else.

More than that, neither the Intangible Forms are not even the Unknown or the Nothing I have already written about in my other works, because if these were the Unknown, they would be opposite to the Knowledge, therefore, all, a Known, what next to be find out by those for whom it is Unknown.

The same, these Intangible Forms are neither, Nothing, precisely on similar considerations, because if they were Nothing, would be a Symbol and a Meaning even for Knowledge, to which, it might be reported, what is not the case in the present equation.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, Intangible Forms are entirely something else than what we can imagine, and precisely that is why they may or may not be correlated with certain causalities or indeterminations, on which we define them, or can not be correlated in that way.

This aspect guides us to think whether the Intangible Forms have a correlated in the Asymptotic Function, or precisely their characteristics about which we do not know anything, or maybe are not even nor characteristics, they may be the ones which determines or does not determine the asymptotism.

If these do not determine asymptotism, this aspect could be underlined again as an Indetermination of asymptotism, resulting even and in our rudimentary logic of Logical Coefficient 2, also a determination, because not only involvement can determine "something", but even and non-involvement, which again leads to an Indeterminism-Determined Cumulatively by Contraversion.

In the case of *Indeterminism Transcendent Direct* the possibility intervenes that, the causal inversion and not only this to can be found in a certain element, thing or even within the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge, in the capacity of Phenomenon or Event in the form of a determinant of a annulment intervened transcendently from a certain causality whose essence consists of another type of Indeterminism, which may be Cumulative of Fund or of, Contraversion.

The same happens in the case of the *Transcendent Indeterminism, Aleatory*, but that there, the causality which determines indetermination and which may consist in determination or indetermination, as before, where I did not specify and this aspect anymore, does not transcend directly, targeting a particular "Target", but randomly targeting a group or a constituent within the respective

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

crowd, determined totally random, but which has as result the respective indeterminism.

*Indeterminism - Determined by the Fund, by the Contraversion, the one Transcendent Direct, as and the Transcendent, Aleatory, have as results their own determined, because any result of an Indeterminant becomes Determined if this is defined by another Indeterminant, as any result of an Indeterminant becomes Determined if this is defined by another Determinant.*

Thus, Determinations of the Indeterminism - Determined by the Fund are:

*Constitutive Determinations, Non-Constitutive Determinations, Complementary Determinations, Non-Complementary Determinations.*

**Determinations of Indeterminism - Determined by Contraversion are:**

*Intangential Determinations, Tangential Determinations, Conjunctural Determinations, Nonconjunctural Determinations, Modal Determinations, Nonmodal Determinations.*

**Determinations of Transcendent Direct Indeterminism are:**

*Relational Determinations, Non-Relational Determinations.*

**Determinations of Transcendent Indeterminism, Aleatory are:**

*Aleatory Determinations or Non-Aleatory Determinations.*

**Definitions are the reportings of the determinations, or how namely, these are reported to other determinations that are defined as such, without**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*that the respective reporting defining a new determination.*

*These are divided into:*

*Definitions of Uniqueness, Definitions of Plurality,*  
*Sequential Definitions and Modal-Sequential Definitions.*

**Determinations of the Indeterminism - Determined by the Fund are:**

**Constitutive Determination**

This type of Determination has as root the Indeterminism-Determined by the Fund which is thus reflected through the asymptotic basis of Logical Function in the relativized frame by the Coaxiological Truth of the same Logical Function where causality asserts itself as a source that can not be structured than on indeterminist basis, but which equally constitutes the relational domain of implementation of the precepts of this Coaxiological Truth, upon the "Infinite Continuum," the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, the Universal Pure Language, but implicitly of what must be defined as "Finality", "Finished", to become comparable to "Continuity" by the reporting to Endless, etc.

**Non-Constitutive Determination**

It is a determination that aims to relativize the "Finality" of the report between this one and the "Infinite Continuum", but also of the report between the same "Finality" and the "Logical Continuum" about which I have already said that is defined as being the "Infinite Continuum", the Universal Pure Language and the Unique

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness together, since defines the Logical Function in ensemble of its characteristics, but and of its attributes upon Everything.

Non-Constitutive Determination overlaps the Constitutive one, precisely for as the relativisation to can be inherent to the "Logical Continuum" and implicitly to the Coaxiological Truth that is part of the Logical Function.

**Complementary Determination**

The same as and Constitutive and Nonconstitutive Determinations and Complementary Determination, it is part of the Determinations of Indeterminism -Determined by the Fund, which by its nature defines the complementarity of the elements that come within its equation, thus approving the fact that no element, no matter the place, role, and mode through which this is defined, is not separated from the rest of the other elements of All, but is part of a vast mechanism, which will be to him always and eternal complementary, both direct, indirect, modal, relational or structural.

In the present case, the Indeterminism -Determined by the Fund, solves a sinuous problem of the "Logical Continuum" on a whole, namely that of to highlight the Balance of this one on the basis of indetermination from its foundations highlighted on the asymptotism supervened through the Intangible Forms.

**Non-Complementary Determination**

The non-complementarity of certain elements determined as such by the root of the Indeterminism-Determined by the Fund can occur due to the initial asymptotism by means of which several possibilities of determinations can intervene, respectively several

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

determinants which to can not be tangential with the system in which they are designed, and thus they become Non-complementary of the system, receiving a complementarity in other systems whereby their structural roots define tangentiabilities.

**Determinations of Indeterminism - Determined by Contraversion are:**

**Intangential Determination**

Compared to the Non-Complementary Determination, which has as root the Indeterminism-Determined by the Fund, within this Intangential Determination that has a different root than the previous Determination, namely the Indeterminism-Determined by Contraversion, where intervenes and here the Asymptotic Function, respectively the asymptotism that impedes tangentiality, only that in this particular case the elements determined by a certain causality can no longer be tangible with other systems, and nor their structural roots do not possess tangentialities so that they can be anchored to other systems and therefore are subjected not only to the causal inversion due to the structuralization of the Logical Function through two different causes with the same effect which is one of the causes, but also to the contraversion of the characteristic of Undefinition of the "Infinite Continuum" that will restore to the original asymptotism the respective Intangible Determination to re-enter on another possible path within the structuralizations of Asymptotic Function based on inversion and contraversion.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Tangential Determination**

This type of determination possesses certain degrees of tangentability with the systems in which the determination is produced, not to be understood by "is produced" that a certain determination begins. No way. They never start, like, they never ending. They are eternal.

Compared to the Determination where tangentabilities were realized, as and the one with root in the Indeterminism- Determined by the Fund, in the Indeterminism -Determined by Contraversion, these tangents are identified by the fact that certain elements are structured so that they become Tangent Determinants but of this Indeterminism-Determined by Contraversion, where tangentiability consists precisely in inversion and contraversion, tangentability that defines them, on these two, precisely by the fact that only thus, through tangentability, systems can be defined and oriented towards the causal inversion, but also to their contraversion. On some aspects of this type of Tangential Determination I have discussed just now.

**Conjunctural Determination**

The quality of Contraversion, but especially that of inversion which directly and promptly intervenes upon causality, inherently, with a base subject to asymptotisms, may "result" (I put it in quotation marks because the term is figurative, because anything that results, has a beginning, that is not the case of our example), - certain Conjunctural Determinations, that are not only depending on the inversion but also the contraversion which is reported to these types of Determinations, which gives them a conjectural character, being possessors both of an inversion

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

or contraversion, but also possessors of the lack of one or the other of these.

All these give them a conjectural character, but great attention, this does not give them the tangential or non-tangential character, because as a rule the Conjunctural Determinations are dual Determinations, ie, compared to their Conjunctural quality, they are also subjected to the tangential or non-tangential determinations, which leads to the cumulation of determinations, within the Indeterminations - Determined by Contraversion, a cumulation of determinations that underlie the essentialization of Logical Function.

**Nonconjunctural Determination**

It is the type of Determination of Indeterminism - Determined by Contraversion, which implies the impossibility that a determinant to can receive the dual quality or not of to become conjunctural, and thus it will not be able to participate in the process of essentialization, respectively of cumulation as and the previous Conjunctural Determinant.

Not participating in the process of essentialization gives it the character of being nonconjunctural, and of affiliating to systemic Determinations, of which its root is part.

However, compared to those Determinants to which they will join, this Determinant has the quality to have access, but also to be complementary with some conjunctural opportunities of essentialization of the Logical Function, but due to the tangentiality of its systemic roots it becomes improper for this process.

On the other hand, the Nonconjunctural Determinant is the type of Determinant which, precisely through its nonparticipation to the conjectural

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

essentialization of cumulation, about which I talked previously, makes that another determinant to can be him that participant, thus to possess the duality of the cumulation of Determinants, respectively and of to be, Conjunctural Determinant.

What namely is at the base of this process?

Two determinations I have just discussed, namely Tangible Determination and Intangible Determination.

**The Modal Determination**

Compared with the conjunctural types of determinants, the modal determinants are those determinants that not only do not establish a certain essentialization through the cumulation of determinants of the Logical Function, but neither intersect in any way with the determinants of tangibility, but are classed or surpass as intermediaries between all other types of determinants of the Indeterminism-Determined by the Fund.

How namely?

Tangential and conjunctural determinants are "hit" within the Indeterminism -Determined by the Fund, by the Non-tangential or Nonconjunctural Determinants, for to become, depending on the root of each, tangent or non-tangent to a particular system, within the Logical Function structure.

For this, and some and others will have to indirectly develop the modal Determinants, why?

Because, for as the other determinants to can be defined within the Indeterminism -Determined by Contraversion, they need the modal determinants, because the Tangential or Conjunctural determinants are not only them, but also their inverses in the posture of Intangential and Nonconjunctural determinants, which would reduce

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

each other, if it were not the inversion of causality and the contraversion of Indeterminism-Determined, respectively.

Thus, this Indeterminism through the reporting to those determinants, determines the Modal Determinants.

By modal determinants, no Tangential Determinant along with its inverse, or, Conjunctural Determinant along with its inverse, can not be canceled, because the Modal Determinants will intervene eternal, which focus on inversion and contraversion.

Thus, when a Tangential Determinant is about to be annihilated by an Intangential determinant, then the Determinant Modal realizes the inversion or contraversion, in this example, the contraversion for that those determinants to can not be annihilated and find their systemic and structural roots where they can accomplish certain tangentabilities.

**Nonmodal Determination**

It is a similar determination to the Modal Determination, based on the same principles as the Modal Determination, only that this reflects on certain determinants with a sense of inversion or contraversion opposite to the Modal Determination.

Nonmodal Determination is the one that provides Balance of the Balances of the Modal Determinations, and vice versa, the Modal Determinations do the same compared to Non-Modal Determinations.

Modal and Nonmodal Determinations are those determinations that are responsible for the development of other Functions, in continuation, such as Conjunctive Functions, Disjunctive Functions, Attributive Functions, etc.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Determinations      of      Transcendent      Direct  
Indeterminism are:**

**The Relational Determination**

This type of determination has a new root, namely, it is within the Transcendent Indeterminism, characterized by the fact that the same determinant can be found both within a certain structural system and in another, which gives it transcendence as such.

This type of Indeterminism is the one that Coaxializes through its own transcendence Everything in the same All, both as Uniqueness but also as Diversity, so Everything is One and One are All.

The Transcendent Indeterminism can be associated even and with Words -Matrix, such as Beginning, End, Origin, but and Nothing or the so-called inherent "Empty" of a "beginning" which actually is eternal, and as we have established any beginning, begin with the end of another beginning.

Thus the Transcendent Indeterminism defines all in the Everything so that the "beginning" of that "Empty" to become transcendent in other systems that are also defined with that Empty, but also, the respective "Empty" is defined by the systems in which it is transported.

Therefore, Indeterminism consists precisely in this relationing of Structural System and "Empty".

The respective relationing is defined as being the Relational Determinant of Direct Transcendent Indeterminism.

Why Direct?

The answer consists in the fact that these "retrievals" of the "Empty" in the Structured System, but and of the Structured System in "Empty" is made directly

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

without the intervention of other determinants that could give a random course of the representation with finality in the "retrieval" of the "Empty", in the Structured System.

**Non-relational Determination**

This type of determination is not at all the reverse of the Relational Determination, because it does not impede the finding of the "Empty" into the Structured System, and nor does it cancel in any way this demarche of Transcendent Indeterminism, but is guarding him from other possible determinants which could ruin him under the aspect of its cancellation through "Empty".

All this is due to the fact that the "Empty" that transcends a certain Systemic Structuralization will make to define with this and this will take the place of the "Empty", and if one would be canceled by the other within the Transcendent Indeterminism and the other would be canceled by the first, and thus everything would be ruined if it were not the Nonrelational Determinant which to "get involved" through the essential inversion of the relations between "Empty" and Systemic Structuralization, so that the "Empty" to can not be canceled, but, nor the Systemic Structuralization in turn.

Why is not called Indetermination-Determined Controversial and is called Transcendental?

This fact is due to the "retrieval" of Everything in All and of All in Everything, that gives it the nuance of transcendence, lacking completely the contraversion of causalities, even if under the aspect of Non-relational Determination the inversion occurs.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Determinations of Transcendent Indeterminism,  
Aleatory are:**

**Aleatory Determinations**

Within this Indeterminism intervenes the random constant, which is a determinant that may belong to any type of Indeterminism that has been mentioned up to now and which, it can interpose to the characteristic of direct transcendence of a determinant within of a Structured System.

The "Empty" of the above example used to define Transcendent Direct Indeterminism is actually a determinant that transcends into a particular Structured System.

In fact, and the Structured System is another determinant in its turn.

This transcending is done directly, without the intervention of a third determinant that can give a random aspect or the "Empty" determinant to be in a certain Structured System which is another determinant or not, and instead of this Structured System, the "Empty" can be found in aleatory mode in another determinant.

For this, it is necessary the constant, which is actually the third determinant.

This third determinant is interposed to the first determinant of being found in the second determinant, by giving the first determinant an aleatory trajectory toward another determinant, between which certain specific Relations are established, such as Relational or Nonrelational Determinations.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Non-aleatory Determinations**

They are specific to the aspects in which the constant or the third determinant that intervenes in the transcendent process is one that belongs to a certain type of relationing, which involves by itself, and the non-relationing that we have just spoken of, precisely, in order to develop this specific relationing.

Non-relationing in its quality of third determinant becomes a constant, as is the Relationing with the difference that the specifics of this constant is substituted or even constituted, as the case: Relationing (another constant) by means of the Aleatory Transcendent Indeterminism, which thus nuances the Non-aleatory Determination.

**Ratios of the Determinations or Definitions**

**Unicity Definitions, Plurality Definitions,**  
**Sequential Definitions, and Modal-Sequential**  
**Definitions**

**When a determination is reported to another determination, a Definition of Unicity takes place.**

**When a determination is reported to multiple determinations, a Definition of Plurality takes place.**

**Sequential Definition** is given by the sequential reporting of the determinants, so, when a determinant is reported to the third to define another determinant, thus, reporting to the third is sequential, because the result not consists in the third, but in another determinant.

**Modal-Sequential Definition** consists when the involvement of the third is made depending of mode of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**relationing of this one with one of the two determinants, or, the determinant resulted, or the determinant.**

*One of the examples of Definition of Uniqueness consists in Logic as such, in the sense given by Logic, because one is the Coaxiological Logic or Logical Function, another is the Word -Matrix, Logic, and another is Logic which we human beings possess and which we have the possibility to get it for us.*

*One can see how the same Logic already has three different meanings, but for each such meaning it is and a determinant, so there will be three different determinants, one being the Logical Function which becomes a determinant of the asymptotism of the Intangible Forms and of the landmark of Negation which determines its Structuralization, then, the Word -Matrix, Logic, about which I have written so far and is part of the Universal Pure Language, so it is a determinant within the "Infinite Continuum" compared to the Logical Function which, even if it has a common point through asymptotism and the landmark of Negation with the "Infinite Continuum", this is not limited only to it, but it becomes the "Logical Continuum" consisting of the "Infinite Continuum" that includes the entire Universal Pure Language and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.*

*So there is a big difference between Logical Function and the Word -Matrix, Logic.*

*These differences may even be determined by human logic, even if the Word -Matrix, Logic has in turn its own developments, as well as the Word -Matrix, Knowledge, or any other Word -Matrix from the infinity of Words-Matrices what belong to the Universal Pure Language.*

*An example of the Plurality Definition consists in the reporting of the Logical Function to the Functions*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*determined by it, which the Logical Function essentializes them according to the characteristic of cumulation.*

*The example of the Sequential Definition would be when a third one intervenes in the person of a determinant, as is the case of the Awareness-Knowledge process that always involves a third one, this third being the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Word -Matrix, of the Knowledge, which transforms Awareness into Knowledge.*

*Finally, to demonstrate the example of the Modal-Sequential Definition, we will need to find a modal relationing of one of the determinants with a third party, which occurs only and only in some cases, being not a rule.*

*Such an example would be the Intervention or the Action of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally upon His own Creation, which precedes a Destiny.*

*We can not admit that the Creation of the Creator Factor is a rule, for to precede Destiny, because it is an Image of Authentic Creation, which having inserted, in its assembly, precisely the Intervention of the Creator Factor, and the determinant of this Intervention is the Creator Factor having as a determinant the Image of Creation, the predecessor of Destiny.*

*This becomes a Sequential-Modal Definition, because the Destiny depends on, the Mode, how the Creation is perfected, respectively its Image taken by the Creator Factor through the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **False or True, Intervention or Non-intervention**

The Logical Function and the Word -Matrix, Logic, in quality of determinants, have and a common point of their, through the reporting to the logic of the human being, namely none, **Not** based on Knowledge as it does the logic of the human being which comes to man as an appanage of Knowledge, because it deals with the lawlike organization of the reality considered objective by man, with the establishment of the right conditions of the thinking, of the forms and general laws of the fair reasoning, and the logic of man makes an abstraction of the concrete content of our various ideas, being a formal science dealing with the notion or the judgment in general, and not with a certain notion or judgment concretely determined.

Moreover, in the dialectical logic of man, logical forms are, due to their differentiated gnoseological value, content-filled forms, and the logical laws on the basis of which these are linked constitute the basic principles of this dialectical logic.

Among the features of this dialectical logic are the concrete identity, which includes and the difference, the complex contradictory predication and the flexibility of the excluded third, which represents for this dialectical logic the concept of truth in the deepening of knowledge.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

It is noticed that the human logic and the way it is perceived by man, of which I have given the example of dialectical logic, but compared to this, would be and other logics, such as, the modal one, or logic of relations, constructivist logic, classical logic, etc.

All these logics are based on Knowledge, because the human being develops within the Word - Matrix of the Knowledge, and this aspect gives human logic the character of science, like the grammar or geometry that analyzes the laws of thought, so, in principle also of Knowledge (known by man).

However, and the human logic is a determinant in its turn of the Logical Function at a much different level than the Logic in quality of Word -Matrix, where it is no longer a science that analyzes the laws of thought, where it no longer relies on Knowledge, how nor the Logical Function is not based, because both for Logical Function as and for Word -Matrix, Logic, the Knowledge is NOT something else than a simple Word -Matrix, from the infinity of Words -Matrices within the Universal Pure Language of the "Infinite Continuum" that is included in the "Logical Continuum".

However, reaching this aspect where we see that we have three determinants where each means something else but they have the same name, the question arises which is the tangency between these three determinants because they have the same name but have almost totally different aspects, one from another.

First of all, we will need to see whose development are these three determinants with the name, the Logic.

First, the Logical Function becomes a development of Intangible Forms, therefore of the asymptotism developed by these Intangible Forms, which thus reflects within the "Infinite Continuum".

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

A similar development would have and the Word - Matrix, the Logic, only that it is defined by the "Infinite Continuum" with all its main characteristics, respectively the Asymptotic Function, the landmark of Negation, Structuralization and Undefinition, compared to the Logical Function defined only on the basis of the asymptotism thus spotted by the Intangible Forms.

So, the Word -Matrix, the Logic, is totally different from the Logical Function, because it becomes determined by the Logical Function or by the "Logical Continuum" from which the "Infinite Continuum" belongs, the same as and each Word - Matrix.

*Here intervenes another problem, namely, for as, the Logical Function to be defined, had to define the Words- Matrices or the Words - Matrices were not defined when the Logical Function was defined?*

*If is so, does it mean that Logical Function does not include in its "Logical Continuum" and Words - Matrices?*

The Words - Matrices were determined once with the definition of the four main characteristics from the "Infinite Continuum" that is part of the "Logical Continuum".

Once defined these characteristics could be defined and the Words - Matrices.

If the Words - Matrices could be defined only after these characteristics have been defined, does it mean that and these Words - Matrices have, a Beginning?

Not under any circumstances, because this process is taking place eternal, atemporal.

"It does not mean that these characteristics were finished at two o'clock and at five o'clock the production of Words - Matrices began."

We can not even speak about the first Word -Matrix than to the extent that we understand that at the respective "beginning" was the Nothing and thus to we define the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Nothing, from a Neosemiotic point of view, as being the first Word -Matrix.

In reality, it is Not absolutely at all so, because all these are not defined through us but without our will or desire, thus we can not speak of the first Word -Matrix, than in the case in which we humans want to have an image through the Illusion of our Life of what might mean the "appearance" of Words - Matrices, depending on the predetermined characteristics of the "Infinite Continuum" that becomes an integral part of the "Logical Continuum."

If the Words - Matrices do not have, a Beginning, then this means that we can not speak neither about the first Word -Matrix, nor the last, because if it had a Beginning, we could not have talked, neither about the "Infinite Continuum," and less about the "Logical Continuum".

Once these Words - Matrices do not have a Beginning, in reality Not exists a first Word -Matrix, means that either all Words - Matrices have been defined once, or exists a first Word -Matrix.

Once again we reach a crossroads, namely if all Words -Matrix were once defined, it would be good because it would not be a first Word -Matrix, so it would not be a Beginning, as it is, but, if these Words - Matrices are defined once, means that Whole Universal Pure Language is defined once, so would not exist the "Continuity" within the "Infinite Continuum" and the "Logical Continuum".

Thus, we either admit a prime Word - Matrix with which, the Universal Pure Language begins, and so we have a Beginning, or if we do not admit this Beginning, we are bound to have an End, through the definition once of the whole Universal Pure Language.

This paradox is precisely the one underlying the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

through which the "Logical Continuum" becomes an intelligent "Logical Continuum", based on rational laws, but also on laws which compared with rational laws would become much more "superior", only if we compare the most rational and intelligent equation determined by human with the breeze of a spring wind, and yet that comparison would not be, not even a fraction of billions.

The paradox about which I spoke, is the one that always puts a hindrance to us, namely, or lets us understand why it can not be a Word -Matrix, Primordial, case in which it closes us the other gate, namely, if it is not a Word -Matrix, Primordial, it should be the Universal Pure Language, defined once, what would mean the impossibility of defining the "Continuum" within the "Infinite Continuum," and if we determine a Word -Matrix, Primordial, would mean that the Universal Pure Language has a Beginning.

Both are false because the Universal Pure Language not only does not have a Beginning but it has not, no End, being part of the "Infinite Continuum" which in turn is part of the "Logical Continuum".

Therefore, when the characteristics of the "Infinite Continuum" were determined eternally and of course infinite, the quality it has the landmark of Negation is precisely that of to cancel the asymptotism of the "Infinite Continuum" perceived as such by Intangible Forms, fact which defines Tangentiability as the opposite of Asymptotism.

Tangentiability is the one that will become the link between the lack of beginning of the Asymptotism and the "Continuum" that will define the "Infinite Continuum" as an eternal continuity, towards another and eternal, new, Word -Matrix of Universal Pure Language.

This fact is accomplished through Tangentiability, through unification due to the tangentiability of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Asymptotism as the first characteristic of the "Infinite Continuum" with the Structuralization of this "Infinite Continuum," thus the Structuralization of the "Infinite Continuum" defined and through the Universal Pure Language receives the valences of the Continuity, precisely due to the Tangentiability which unites this Structuralization with the Asymptotic Function that will give it the impetus of "Continuity".

Thus, precisely the Tangentiability that could be defined by us as being, the Finite, because it is opposite to Continuity, is that which will unite the Continuity by the finite definition of each Word-Matrix in part, defining the "Infinite Continuum".

So, when we do not accept a Beginning of Universal Pure Language, we do it precisely because the Finite (Tangentiability) is the one responsible for the lack of the Beginning, how it is equally responsible for the lack of the End.

Therefore, the "Infinite Continuum" is a combination of Infinite and Finite which becomes "Continuum" through Finite, and Finite through Infinite.

How namely it becomes Finite through Infinite?

Because Tangentiability is defined by the Asymptotism initiated by Intangible Forms.

Where does rationality or intelligence appear in these relationships?

The fact that the Asymptotism is "transported" by Tangentiability to assure its own Continuity means that the rational is defined by Tangentiability by Ensuring Infinite Continuity.

This is the basis of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

We humans see the Lack of Beginning, of the Universal Pure Language, as being the Nothing or the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

"Empty" and are obligated due to our Logical Coefficient 2, due to our ability to reason, to we define this "Empty" or Nothing as being the first Word - Matrix in the Universal Pure Language, even if he is actually the Lack of Beginning!

I once wrote about this "first", Word -Matrix of the Universal Pure Language, and, be recorded, as such, how the last Word -Matrix within the Universal Pure Language is precisely the Lack of End!

In the Lack, consists, the Asymptotism, and in, the End, Tangentiability, how, in the Beginning consists the Tangentiability, and in Lack, the Asymptotism.

Thus, the Asymptotism will always be the Lack and the Tangentiability will always be the Beginning and Ending.

How namely the Logical Function becomes a characteristic of "Infinite Continuum", when the "Infinite Continuum" is part of it?

The answer consists when this one identifies itself with its Structuralization, because the Logical Function is the first eternal determination of the "Infinite Continuum" after this one has been perceived by Intangible Forms as being an *asymptotic* determinant.

*Thus, NOT the Intangible Forms are asymptotic, but the "Infinite Continuum" of Logical Function or "Infinite Continuum" within the "Logical Continuum" is perceived by Intangible Forms as being an Asymptotic Function, and "Infinite Continuum" responds to Intangible Forms through the "Logical Continuum", which defines him that, is not an Asymptotic Function but an eternal Tangent to its own "Continuity," which is a Coaxial "Continuity" precisely because of the Tangent, for which each "Continuity" of a new Word -Matrix becomes a link based on the Analogy of Everything with*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Everything being Everything (uniqueness) in All, but also being part of All (diversity) in Everything.*

*This is the basis of Coaxialism.*

Thus the Logical Function becomes a determinant of the Asymptotic Function and of the Landmark of Negation becoming the Structuralization of the "Infinite Continuum," but this Structuralization from the point of view of the Logical Function compared to the "Infinite Continuum" stops only at this quality, namely of to be a characteristic of the "Infinite Continuum" because from its point of view, the Logical Function does not just remain a Structuralization of the "Infinite Continuum", but includes within it the Whole "Infinite Continuum" but also the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, becoming Everything, but and Everything Behind Everything.

Instead, this Everything from the Back of Everything, which is the Logical Function, is perceived by the "Infinite Continuum" as Structuralization of it.

This aspect gives to the Logical Function the quality to define itself as being **AND** the Universal Pure Language, **SHE** being or having within it **AND** the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

Thus, the Logical Function gathers both the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, as and the Universal Pure Language.

Then why does appear and the Word - Matrix, the Logic?

What namely is this Word - Matrix, Logic?

The Logical Function, once defined through the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness as and through the Universal Pure Language, means that it is the Function underlying the "Logical Continuum" through itself, identifying itself with it.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, this Function is a law or determines an ensemble of laws by identifying it with both the Universal Pure Language, and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness?

The question becomes even more imperious because a clarification is required regarding the categories of determinations, mentioned above.

Can all these be determined without certain set of laws ?

These categories of the determinations or the Indeterminations are not subjected to a certain set of laws that I already have inserted structuring these categories in the previous pages?

The fact that the Logical Function include within it and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, can it exclude the notion of set of laws?

If it accepts this notion of set of laws it means that we return to human logic and define the Logical Function as being a law based on strict criteria which is subject to certain canons and so science becomes ready, and Logical Function becomes like other logics, a science analogous with geometry or grammar, through which are established certain interdependencies of logical order.

*First of all, in order to be determined a certain logic of the set of laws, this will have to focus, above all, on the human logic whose laws are based on certain logical principles already known as being the law of identity, the law of non-contradiction, the law of the third excluded and the law of reason sufficient.*

*Therefore, the law of abstract identity is subordinated to the law of concrete identity, and the law of the third excluded from the dialectic of categories of truth and false.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

As a thing to be true or false, we must first of all to have the truth defined as being, depending on another truth or a false one, at which this one will be reported.

When the Logical Function becomes a determinant of the asymptotisms of Intangible Forms, it can not define the truth from false, and nor is it defined in relation to another precedent truth, because he is not determined, appearing in the equation only with the Coaxiological Truth based on the first characteristic defined, and as principle or axiom of the Logical Function, but all of these are not subject to a set of laws strict as such, which to can define the truth from false and therefore, nor the principle can not be defined in relation to the axiom or the characteristic, only after that the Coaxiological Truth intervenes, which appears in the unfolding of the equation in its totality only after the Logical Function is defined as such.

Do we have any of these within the Logical Function?

The answer is **NO!** Why do **NOT** we have, none valid?

Because all these laws involve **Knowledge, or Recognition** of another element by an element, and the other, to can not have this possibility of to Know.

But the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, is not and Knowledge?

Can it be Consciousness without Knowledge?

**YES! CONSCIOUSNESS IS NOT KNOWLEDGE.**

Consciousness has nothing to do with the Knowledge than in the worlds of Knowledge.

In more of my works I wrote about the difference between Awareness and Knowledge, about the fact that and the human being, is Aware of something and something else Knows, about the fact that, in order to Know, it will be necessary first of all that the man or the Cognizant subject,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

to send his own Awareness to a Mirror element which, in turn, to reflect him, this Awareness in the form of Knowledge, back.

Thus the Awareness - Knowledge process always involves a **third** party.

This **third** party does not exist in any way within the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, and nor within the Word -Matrix of the Logic or within the "Infinite Continuum," respectively of the Universal Pure Language, because this third party will be able to occur only and only in the worlds developed by the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge, and it will only exist if the "Infinite Continuum" or the Universal Pure Language or the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, will be Mirrored within an element found in the worlds of the Word - Matrix of the Knowledge, and such an element being, ultimately, even and the human being.

Thus, Knowledge only occurs through Mirroring being an image more or less close to the Awareness, but also to the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness or the "Infinite Continuum", therefore Logical Function is a Function without Knowledge which does not focus, neither on the set of laws, nor on certain characteristics given by certain abstractisation of the Knowledge, than to the extent that it becomes Mirrored by Knowledge, and ultimately even and by the Man.

We can not state with firmness and certainty that these are the true principles or characteristics of the Logical Function or of the Coaxiological Truth, because neither we do **NOT** Know the Truth than deformed depending on the image which the Mirror of Knowledge reflects to us, above all about ourselves, and then, about what surrounds us.

The fact that we have established all sorts of abstractisation regarding certain sets of laws, this does NOT mean that these sets of laws exist in reality, because

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

neither the abstractisations on the basis of which we determine them, can NOT be associated with reality, than through, association with certain experiences on which the reality reveals them for us, such as that we have two apples.

These apples, we will know that they are two because we see them before our eyes. They can be weighed, tasted, seen, etc.

Thus we will be able to define an abstractisation on the basis of experience, namely that an apple and an apple make two apples, but we do NOT know what namely can mean two elements which we can not submit to our experience (which is also an Illusion, but claiming the contrary in this case that our experience is not an Illusion of Life) - the two elements are subject to an abstractisation by which we know that there are two, because also the abstractisation itself is rendered to us by the Mirror of knowledge.

If this abstractisation does Not reveal the truth?

If the image we know is false as well as the truth reflected by the Mirror of Knowledge?

Can we feel abstractisation based on an experience?

The answer is obviously: **NO!**

No one can experience with his own senses the essence of abstraction, so he can not feel it.

Then our human logic tells us that what we can not feel, or experiment is not true.

However, we consider abstractisations to be true because we associate them with our experiments based on the senses.

The example with the two apples is conclusive in this respect.

Thus, on the basis of this association, the whole human logic defined on Knowledge is developed.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

If we did not make this association with the abstract element, we would not have nor a science within this world.

The fact in itself is not enough revealing because we always know that mathematics will calculate us correctly the number of apples.

Then it means that the abstractization which we do not Know in quality of its essence, is revealing, with what the Mirror of Knowledge reveals us.

If this abstractization is revealing, then it means that we know what namely is Truth, because, and to this one, we can refer in the form of abstractization.

No matter how verisimilar or unlikely it may seem, abstractization becomes the one that tells us that a certain Truth is true or a certain Truth is false.

From here intervenes the relativity of Truth within the abstractization.

This determines us to abstract the abstractization as such, as being, or true, or false, because if we think with a Logical Coefficient 7, besides these two "or", there will still be five more "or".

If the abstractization can be or true or false, and its essence can be or true or false, a fact that quite revealing to define the relativity of our truth, even and when we do **NOT** want to admit that we are actually living the Illusion of Life, when we want to be partisans of the fact that we actually live the reality of every day.

It is just as true or false, no one can know this unless than if it intends to declaim it as such, that everything that I write in these moments is due to the abstraction which, in our everyday life, stands quietly on certain axioms and thus, leads us toward, new and new abstractizations.

The fact that these appear to us, as being relative, I think that is the most important thing, because it

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

demonstrates us just as false or true that neither relativizations in itself can not be or can be true.

And I, now when I write this work based on Coaxiological Logic, which is revealed to me also on the basis of abstractizations, I can Not know what namely is false or true, also, I can not find out if really exists a real difference between axiom and principle, between characteristic and axiom, because through Coaxialism all these differences are canceled, becoming One in All and All in One, thus being the Unique path to go on the path of a Single Truth, be it and false within our abstractizations, because any truth regardless of whether it is true or false all truth is called.

Going on this path if what I insert in this book is false means that her opposite is true, and if is true it means that her opposite is false.

Do we know which are the characteristics of the false Truth or True ? NOT!

Because what appears to us as false Truth, can in turn be true Truth or false, and what appears to us as True Truth, may in turn be True Truth or false, so if we go on this path at infinity we will see that neither a Truth can not be true, but, nor false, than only and only according to our abstraction.

That is why the principles about which I write at these moments do NOT have to be taken as such, respectively as principles of Logical Function, because from the point of view of the sets of laws of our human logic, they are NOT such a thing and nor, they do not have how to be, not being determined by an Truth that is defined definitively as such through certain characteristics.

At this moment I define definitively the Coaxiological Truth, through and the basics of the Logical Function which I define them, but once these

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**bases become principles and characteristics simultaneously, and once these bases establish the basics of the Coaxiological Truth, it is premature to speak of principles in the true sense, which DOES NOT exist!**

**It is only after all these will be defined definitively and in reporting with the Coaxiological Truth, it can be defined according to these Principles or basis which is the definition, of, Principle, in Coaxiology!**

Finally, can we establish a set of laws without Knowledge, or could function a set of laws independently of Knowledge ?

Could exist the Truth independent of Knowledge?

We will first have to start by answering the second question, then returning to the first.

The Coaxiological Truth is a Truth occurred before Knowledge, as well as other Truths from my previous works, such as the Semiotic Truth, Neonotional, Notional, etc., up to the level of Truth known by us, people.

For a law to be true, the Truth will have to exist first and foremost, whether this is true or false.

Once the Truth appears, he by its essence can be defined as a set of laws only to the extent that it defines a certain set of laws, and in order to determine it, it will have to define on itself as being a Truth compared to a certain Landmark.

In our case, this Landmark may be precisely the Landmark of Negation, the one who denies the asymptotism of Intangible Forms.

On this basis, we can affirm that the Coaxiological Truth can receive the character of set of laws, only that the Landmark of Negation denies the asymptotisms of the Intangible Forms to the Logical Function that it Structuralizes, and thus defines it, an equation in which,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

although intervene the parallelism and the cumulative quality what defines to the Logical Function the aspect of esentialisation, the Coaxiological Truth does not yet appear in the equation, than once with finalization of the first principle of Logical Function, when the Landmark of Negation already has its first Structuralization defined toward the Undefinition which returns the path to asymptotism, defining a cycle in which the Logical Function is defined as being the "Infinite Continuum", cycle that owes the "continuity" of this "Infinite Continuum".

In this first cycle, the Coaxiological Truth appears, and the nomination, of prime, has aspect of eternity, in no way, of beginning, because in this first eternity Everything and is developing in All, and not outside of it, and Everything from behind Everything, is precisely this eternity that continues, through its back, defining in her a new and new such cycle.

That "new" being always an other Everything hich is included in the Everything, coming from behind this one, or from inside of its spiral, if that explanation is more plastic.

It is quite plausible the fact that the Truth defines a certain set of laws, but any law, must occur and be reflected upon "something," fact which implies an Event, and this one, in turn, can be from within an eventful succession to define a particular Phenomenon or not.

This fact involves a compulsory Beginning, because, even and in the case in which the law is reflected upon "something," this reflection begins and ends once and once.

In the case that we are talking about an eternal reflection upon "something", then this one can not be produced upon that "something", because, in order to produce it is necessary the beginning, because any

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

production must begin, and if it does not begin it is no longer production or reflection upon "something", but it interposes with that "something", because if, and the production and that something are eternal or infinite, no distinction can be made between that "something" and when is produced another "something" upon him.

Because and the production itself is also a "something" that here intervenes as a "something else" and for as two "something" to become tangent through one of them which defines production means that tangency has an obligatory initial landmark in cases when the two "something" are infinite, because if they were finite, the tangent could be in their initial moment or in their beginning.

Thus, the "production" or "reflection" of "something" over another "something" necessarily implies an initial moment.

Therefore, any set of laws needs a certain initial moment for to occur over a certain: "something."

So we can not talk about law or a set of laws even though in the Logical Function intervenes the Coaxiological Truth, this one can not define a certain **initial** moment even and through the landmark of Negation, because cycles overlap within the same Everything, even if they are considered to be from Behind the Everything.

Moreover, any set of laws provides for a certain Event through which this one is reflected by or acting on the element, Event or Phenomenon.

In conclusion, absolutely any set of laws can only be structured within the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, where it occurs once with the Primordial Event produced through the Lack from Semantic.

What namely does the set of laws replace at the level of the first characteristics of the Logical Function, respectively, of the parallelism, of the essentialization

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

defined through cumulation of functions and Coaxiological Truth?

Even though at this level one can not talk about an initial moment and nor about a Beginning which to define a border between the asymptotism which intermediates the connection with the Intangible Forms and the Logical Function.

This asymptotism consists precisely in the Non-Beginning, and the landmark of Negation denies the asymptotism, ie, the Non-Beginning, where the straight lines do not unite, realizing a second parallelism, and this NOT within the asymptotism, therefore of the Asymptotic Function through the two straight lines of its, which tend one toward another without to unite, but exterior this, causing another parallelism compared to asymptotism through the Structuralization of the Logical Function, which is defined as being the "Infinite Continuum," on which will include it in the "Logical Continuum," and that parallelism consists in the first characteristic - principle of the Logical Function.

Thus, the notion of set of laws on which we attribute is achieved only within the context of the developments caused by the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, where, the Event and the Phenomenon intervene.

To talk about a set of laws without Event or Phenomenon, it is as if you affirm that it does not reflect itself and does not produce itself on any other "something", and for to define a set of laws as being "something", as being that "something", which neither is produced and nor reflects itself on another "something", but, eternal and separate from the systemic and structural context, or from the one of developments or the definitions, means that is NO longer a set of laws but totally something else.

However, we can only speak of a certain Phenomenon that is the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, where

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

no longer intervenes the succession of events of the type Event-Phenomenon, as I wrote in *Antichrist, Being and Love, p. 121-122*, I quote:

"..... we can not define a certain initial moment of reflection of" something" in the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, as it is in the case of the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, because from the point of view Neosemiotic, the Suggestive, - Matrix, Distributive, does not consist in reflecting the Common Expressions of Words - Matrices in the Semantic Mirror of Knowledge because and the Knowledge is a Word - Matrix from an infinity that participates at the completion of Universal Pure Language.

The Neosemiotic phenomenon is defined by the Distributive Capacity of the Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, which can be partially reflected in both the Common Expressions of Words-Matrices Groups and in each Expression of each Word -Matrix in part.

By the Expression of the Word - Matrix, is meant the totality of the characteristics of that Word - Matrix.

These characteristics are reflected through the medium of the Sugestitive-Distributive Quality of the Expression of Universal Pure Conscious within it, giving to the Word -Matrix, respectively the nuancing of its own Expression within the Universal Pure Consciousness as being Word of the Universal Pure Language.

This aspect of the Sugestiv-Distributive side within the **Neosemiotics**, results in the mode of interrelation between the Words of Universal Pure Language and Universal Pure Consciousness on the basis of Expressions that are spoken within the Universal Pure Language to delimit the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness from the rest of the Common Expressions.

**The branch, Suggestive - Distributive is divided into two degrees of comparison of the Suggestive - Distributive, namely, the Suggestive -Distributive**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Convergent degree and the Suggestive -Distributive  
Divergent degree.**

*These two degrees are precisely those that determine the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, being inclusively and the basic characteristics of the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, Phenomenon which is at the basis of Phenomenological Coaxiology, and which is not based on an Initial Event as the rest of the Phenomena which I have mentioned in my books until at the moment, because at Neosemiotic level it can not be an Initial Event that occurs only by reflecting a certain Event in the Semantic Mirror of the Infinity that gives birth to the First Event or Primordial Event that defines the Primordial Phenomenon in its turn", end the quote.*

However, if that "something" does not occur on "something else" but is defined or developed in such a way that it directly or indirectly, is reflected, and on that "something", without to exist an intervention, is it no longer a set of laws?

No, in the moment when it does Not exists an intervention of that "something" on "something else" we can no longer speak of a set of laws, but of a Function which precedes the non-intervention on "something", but, on its functional basis this non-intervention defines a report compared to "something," as in the case of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness which, through Logical Function does Not intervene within the Universal Pure Language, but it is reported to this, even if by reporting, the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is nothing but the sum of all Expressions of Words - Matrices of the Universal Pure Language reported through the Logical Function to the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, which belongs to the Logical Function, and thus the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Logical Function is reported, through itself, for itself, in perpetuating the "Logical Continuum".

**Thus, the Neosemiotic Phenomenon participates in determination of the functional characteristic of the Function that actually replaces what we know and perceive, we, humans, as set of laws.**

*Thus, the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is actually the sum of Expressions of Words-Matrices which are reported through the Logical Function at them themselves, and Pure Consciousness is part of the Sum of Expressions of Words-Matrices which through the Logical Function (please pay attention, the Logical Function does Not have nothing to do with the canons of the Logic of human being, being another logic) accomplishes this reporting.*

*The sum of Expressions of Words-Matrices is essentialized through the characteristic, of cumulation, of the Logical Function through this.*

*The respective essentialization of the sum of the Expressions of the Words-Matrices defines the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.*

*The sum of Expressions of Words-Matrices, once essentialized, is NO longer what can be defined as the sum of these Expressions of Words-Matrices, but as the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.*

*The Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is the essence of the sum of the Expressions of the Words-Matrices.*

*This essence, no longer being the sum itself, but its essence, is reported at sum, thus defining the Universal Pure Language and its Expressions.*

That is why I have always emphasized this, namely the fact that the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness is not the sum of the Expressions of the Words-Matrices, but this sum is reported to the Unique

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness through Logical Function.

*In conclusion, the set of laws only intervenes in the worlds developed by the Word-Matrix of Knowledge where the Intervention can exist, and at rest at all levels does not exist the notion of set of laws, but of Function that replaces the set of laws.*

*All of these are part of the Definitions of Uniqueness, because they are reflected on a unique frame, either Logical Function or any other determinant thereof, or within the equation of defining can participate, one or more elements, but through the Definition of Uniqueness each element in part, receives its own definition in part and not an overall definition alongside other elements.*

*Thus, when we talk about the fact that the Neosemiotic Phenomenon defines the functionality of the Logical Function, we refer only to the Logical Function, and when it defines the functionality of all the functions we refer to all possible functions, so, to their ensemble.*

*By defining the functionality of the Logical Function, the Neosemiotic Phenomenon determines by Logical Function and some of its characteristics, and Logical Function will be the one which in turn will take over these characteristics and will determine the functionalities of the other functions and NOT the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, because the Logical Function has the characteristic of essentialization through which it becomes the essence of all other Functions but also of the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, and therefore this essence in the person of the Logical Function will determine the functionality of other Functions, functionality that radically differs from one Function to another and is represented through the characteristics of the respective Function.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Thus, the characteristics of a Function do not consist in the sets of laws after which the respective Function is guided, but in the Functionality of that Function, which has as its basis and essence the Logical Function, whose Functionality is determined by the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, determined in turn by the two degrees of the Suggestive - Distributive, namely, the Suggestive-Distributive, Convergent, and Suggestive - Distributive, Divergent.*

*Again, let's not make the mistake of considering that, if the Neosemiotic Phenomenon develops the characteristic of functionality to the Logical Function, this determines it in some way or another. No, by no means.*

*The Neosemiotic Phenomenon only occurs when the necessary conditions are met for as this to be intercalated on the Logical Function scene and not vice versa.*

*In order for these conditions to be fulfilled, it is necessary to be already in the equation, both the "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, and next to it as a quintessence of all, the Logical Function, with its characteristics necessary for the introduction into "scene" of the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, and thus, of its own functionality of Logical Function.*

*The question is how namely the Logical Function could to integrate the "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness without having a certain functionality because the "Infinite Continuum" involves the Universal Pure Language and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness implies the reporting of the sum of the Expressions of this Universal Pure Language to the Logical Function that defines thus, the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.*

*What is meant by functionality?*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*It means a certain intervention on another system or structure that has a result.*

*The respective result consists in a certain functionality of a system or structure over others.*

*Examples would be countless, but we take the action of a piston over the steam.*

*The result consists in the functionality of the piston over the steam.*

*Of course, that the types, modes, and cases of functionality are countless.*

*As I have already said, we, people, understand through functionality, the Intervention, which in the case of the Asymptotic Function is a functionality determined by the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, and not a functionality which involves the Action or which has as result an Intervention (Action) of the Logical Function on other Functions, because although the Intervention is defined and through the set of laws in our world, it can be defined in the absence of the set of laws and through Determinants and Non-determinants, but only, especially and when the set of laws is completely absent, because the set of laws can only be within the Word - Matrix of the Knowledge being determined depending on a particular Event.*

*A set of laws without Event can not be, because the set of laws implies action.*

*In the absence of the Event, the place of the set of laws is taken over by the reportings of the Determinants and Non-Determinants.*

*Coaxiological functionality can not be defined through intervention because it is Not an action on a particular Function, because the Neosemiotic Phenomenon can not act on the functionality of the Logical Function, on which determines her, as being himself, and the functionality of this Logical Function as being part of the Logical Function, and not as an action coming from*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**outside** this Logical Function, because this "outside" does not exist in the respective context, because the Logical Function is Everything from Behind the Everything, is the "Logical Continuum".

Once can not exist an action from the outside, the action from the "interior" is defined as being the Logical Function and anything we understand as an intervention on this Logical Function from the Neosemiotic Phenomenon becomes **an intervention of the intervention**, which follows thus at endlessly, because once **the intervention** is represented by the Neosemiotic Phenomenon and this intervenes on the Logical Function **which is Everything**, therefore precisely **the intervention** upon which it **intervenes** being Everything, **the intervention** in this case is reduced to itself, amplifying itself at the endlessness of its own self of intervention upon the intervention, which results : **Non-intervention**.

Thus, the Neosemiotic Phenomenon is defined by the Asymptotic Function on the basis of the Suggestive-Distributive Convergent, and Suggestive-Distributive Divergent, which in turn defines the Functionality of the Logical Function, what consists in : Non-intervention.

It is clear, on what the Non-intervention is based, namely, on convergence and divergence.

These two actually include the Functionality of the Logical Function.

Thus, due to the Neosemiotic Phenomenon, appear the two degrees of its, the Suggestive-Distributive Convergent, and Suggestive-Distributive Divergent, thus once with the functionality of the Logical Function appear the convergence and divergence, a turning factor for defining relations between various functionalities of the Functions developed by Logical Function within the wider of the "Logical Continuum".

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Also, convergence and divergence can determine (what and they do it), functional characteristics the most diverse.

Thus Functionality of Logical Function does Not focus on a set of laws, because it focuses on Non-Intervention.

Everything from Behind the Everything, but and the Everything from his Face, respectively the "Logical Continuum" is based on Non-Intervention.

Even Non-intervention can be an intervention in turn, because and the Truth can be either false or true, which means that and this Non-intervention is a relative one?

No, in no case, because in this particular case of the "Logical Continuum" we can not talk about a functionality based on a relative Truth, because at the moment when the functionality is "appearing in scene" we have not defined all the characteristics of the Coaxiological Truth for it to define the functionality as being true or false, because the Coaxiological Truth will be fully defined, once with the completion of another Principle - Characteristic - Axiom of the Logical Function, which will participate in the definition of the Coaxiological Truth in its totality and not only in its partialness, as happens with the parallelism and essentialization of the Logical Function which define the premises of the Coaxiological Truth.

We can not define thus a Coaxiological Truth in itself, but only some nuances of it.

The Coaxiological Truth can not define, on the other hand, the Functionality of the Logical Function, because if it does this, it would become equivalent to Functionality itself, so with Logical Function, because the Functionality of Logical Function is based on convergences and divergences which defined as being the Coaxiological Truth would automatically become part of the Intervention,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

which would distort the entire Functionality of the Logical Function, because where the Truth is defined, but any Truth, not only the Coaxiological Truth, is defined implicitly once with it and the **Intervention because Intervention can be true or not**, and the Non-intervention, the same.

Every truth consists in the reporting to its opposite, otherwise it could no longer be true or false.

*If we consider the Functionality of Logical Function as being defined by the Coaxiological Truth, we should accept that the Intervention is the same as and the Non-Intervention a part of this Functionality of the Logical Function.*

*Thus the convergence or divergence of the Neosemiotic Phenomenon would have causality in Intervention or Non-intervention, meaning that, through Intervention is acting according to a set of laws, and the Functionality would become a set of laws, subjecting itself, to some canons, and these would consist of the asymptotisms of the Intangible Forms and the landmark of Negation, becoming Structuralized through the Intervention on the Logical Function, so on the "Logical Continuum" that frames the "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.*

*This would prove that the "Infinite Continuum" itself with the whole Universal Pure Language is a resultant of the Intervention of Intangible Forms, what can NOT be true, because if it were such a resultant, it would NO longer be "Infinite Continuum", it would no longer be the Everything from Behind the Everything, and nor would that "Continuum" of Universal Pure Language, but everything would be "frozen", according to the Intervention.*

*Once Everything would no longer be "Continuous", it would no longer be, neither the Unique*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, because it is reported to the "Infinite Continuum," and the reporting would make no sense, because the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness would become one and the same with the Universal Pure Language once this would not be "Continuous," so, it would not be defined through the occurrence at infinity of new and new Words-Matrices which to define the Universal Pure Language.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**CHAPTER V**

**Relativity and Complementarity of the  
Logical Function defined through the  
Coaxiological Truth**

Absolutely any Truth becomes Relative if it is not defined as being the Absolute Truth.

Some philosophers considered that, all Truths are relative, apart from the Absolute Truth, but that we, humans know at least one grain from the Absolute Truth.

I think it can not be a greater stupidity than you to say that the Absolute Truth could be known partially, and if you knew, a part of this Absolute Truth, you would know and the reality.

For the dementia to reach the absurd, the materialists even believed in this kind of reality, and they also attributed it the statute of objectivity, the statute on the basis of which they were delirious in years and years, some have obtained doctorates reflecting the degree of stupidity and decay, where the human being can reach, and others to become even more ridiculous, have obtained even recognitions or great dignities, being delirious on the nature of objectivity.

Shame for those crooks of the philosophy who allied themselves with politicians same perfidious for to give birth to a monstrous society, a society of the lies, just as their philosophy was, a society where stupidity and

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

ignorance were at a place of honor and on which, in onerous mode, they called her, the Socialist Society, stealing and denigrating, with shamelessness, this great dream of mankind of justice and equality, of real beauty of the human spirit that consists of true socialism.

How can you say that a fragment from the Absolute Truth can show the reality, when the Absolute Truth can NOT be, crumbled, because, any slice how small you cut from it, he would no longer be Absolute Truth as such, because it would lack something of it, and once a fragment is missing even from the Absolute Truth, it is no longer Absolute Truth, because it is not in its absolute totality.

It is either the whole Absolute Truth or it is no longer at all.

By "absolute" is meant precisely the Everything, the Whole, the Plenitude that is perfected through this All, which is the absolute in itself.

You can not define a Truth divided even and Relatively if it is defined as such, that is, as Whole Truth, because that part of from the Divided Truth will always be another Truth and never part from the Truth, from which, it broke.

To consider that you break a fraction from the Absolute Truth, it does not mean to possess the Absolute Truth through the fact, of to be able to distinguish him through the fraction that you broke from him.

It can not be that, because always the fragment which you will have in your hand, even if it is part of this Absolute Truth, will be immediately and definitely another Truth.

Many say that a Truth Truncated is part of the Truth from which it has broken.

It is not at all true.

Even if the truncated part resembles the Truth from which it has separated, this one is another Truth, because in

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

its totality defines another determinant, and not on the one, on which the Whole Non-truncated Truth has defined him.

When the Truncated Truth defines another determinant than the Truth from which it has separated, this is another Truth.

In conclusion, the Truth can not be truncated because in this case it will determine another determinant, being another Truth.

The notion of Truth itself includes a definition that consists in a reporting to a third party that has a certain determinant.

Can exist and two or more Truths which to posses the same determinant, but that does not mean that they are truncated from another Truth that has possessed the same determinant.

It is a rule that the Truth that possesses or determines a certain determinant can not be truncated, because in that case it will no longer determine the same determinant, a case referring only to the same Truth.

By truncating, the Truth is changing, and once changed, he can no longer determine the same determinant, because and the Truth will be different.

What would happen if, through change (truncation), the Truth would in turn determine the same determinant as the truncated part from him?

This would lead to the fact that every Truth is as false as it is true, when it changes, having the same result.

So we could exemplify this way: "The right way is the shortest."

If from the sentence, we cut "right is" would be "The shortest way".

The difference is overwhelming, because one is "The Right Way is the shortest" and the other is, "Right is," and the other is "The shortest way" that no longer shows the fact that only the right one is the shortest.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, any truncation changes the result, and a truth can only highlight the result which this one defines him, because the Truth is and the Image of its own result, as the result is the image of its own Truth.

If you change the face from Mirror, you will change and its image.

In the last hypostasis, even and when the Truncation of Truth would resemble the Truth itself, this one would always be its Truncation and in no case the Truth Himself, because a similarity remains a resemblance, and in no way, can not replace the elements that resemble.

Moreover, in the case of Truth, which may be true or false, this "true" highlights us the fact that the Truth is substituted with our reason through which a determinant may or may not be in a certain hypostasis.

This true or false identifies us an interventionist mode of finding the Truth.

If it were not this interventionist mode of action, starting from the human intervention to that of Our Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally, we could not understand the Truth in any way.

Thus, the Truth of the human being is a Truth of the Intervention given by an action that has taken place sometime in the past, which has as its Origin the Intervention of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally that preceded the Destiny, through the Creation perfected, once, Incidentally.

*This Intervention on Creation, through Creation, Uniqueness and Happening, of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally, has led to a precedent "before" Destiny.*

Thus, the Truth from within the Destiny will have, always and ever a "**PAST**" of its, being a Truth with Past, so with Intervention.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Between false and true, can not exist than a modal causality based on the **Intervention** of the Creator Factor and, Unique Incidentally.

People, however much they will try to find out which is the true Truth and which is the false Truth, they will reach the Intervention that has been made, preceding the Destiny, and so they will have to understand which is the falsity but and the veracity within the respective Intervention.

For our world, the Absolute Truth is identified with the Intervention or action of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally, on which he accomplishes it through his own Creation, which is an Image of the Word- Matrix, of the Creation.

If for our world this is the Absolute Truth, does it mean that are more Absolute Truths?

The fact of to be, more Absolute Truths entitles us to affirm that none of these **is Not Absolute**, because it does not represent the Everything through its absolutism, but only slices from this Everything, and any Truncated Truth is no longer the Whole Truth, as any slice from the Absolute Truth is no longer the Absolute Truth.

From this perspective, we will have to look at things in the light of the elements which participate to defining the Absolute Truth.

In the present case is the Intervention, primarily due to the disjunctive function of the Unique and the Happening, a function which reflects on Creation, but also on the Words -Matrices from the group of the five with the attributive Functions, respectively: the End, Beginning, Origin and Creation, but also on Knowledge at the same time, but also separately (disjunctively) on each one in part.

From here results the Unique and Incidentally character on which the Expressions of these Words -

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Matrices have, in the mirrored Image in the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite.

Thus each Word -Matrix in part or each element in part determined on functional basis as well as each Function in part being a determinant that has the essence and root in the Logical Function that is defined through the "Logical Continuum" will be defined by its own Truth.

*It does not exists Absolute Truth only if this refers as a particularity to certain elements, in the sense that if this element is defined as a determinant or determinate, this definition is true, and if the respective definition is also part of the peak of a pyramid of determinations, that "peak" it may be considered the Absolute Truth for its determinations within the pyramid, but it should not be overlooked the fact that, that pyramid will never be the unique pyramid.*

*In conclusion, it does not exists Absolute Truth, than an absolute determinant for a certain range of other determinants, which is distinguished through its uniqueness to the plurality of other determinants, but, Uniqueness only from the point of view of its determinations, as is and the case of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally whose Intervention is Unique and Incidentally, compared to our world, and the Absolute Truth of our world will consist in this Intervention, which by its Unique and Incidentally character preceded Destiny, which in turn, having not an Unique and Incidentally character, no longer possesses an Absolute Truth, but the one relative depending on the Absolute Truth of Intervention.*

Thus the Absolute Truth is Unique and Incidentally, compared to a particular Landmark such as our human world in this case.

I say the human world because the animal or plant world considers other landmarks compared to our world,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

even if we believe that animals or plants also feel and think like us.

However, man's reporting to the absolute is an Illusion as great as it is the entire Illusion of his Life.

**Any Absolute Truth, even if it becomes Unique compared to a particular Landmark, he is Relative compared to other Landmarks.**

Neither the Coaxiological Truth, is not an Absolute Truth, because and this one focuses on its Relativity within the "Logical Continuum", being a **Relative, Neosemiotic, Substituent, Motivational, Complementary Truth.**

Coaxiological Truth is an Neosemiotic Truth because it refers implicitly and to the Words -Matrices of the Universal Pure Language being a Truth that is not structuralized only within the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge.

Thus, Knowledge no longer has any relevance.

Regarding its Motivational part, here a bracket must be made and about the Intervention of the Intangible Forms, namely whether Asymptotism is an Intervention of the Intangible Forms or not.

The answer consists, undoubtedly, in the fact that YES, the Asymptotism is due to the Intervention of Intangible Forms, only that this one becomes Motivated only, once with the Logical Function through the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, on which acts alongside of Asymptotism and Tangentiality, so the Motivation of the Intervention becomes a Purpose of the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness.

By Intervention we define an action upon the "something", fact that we have already discussed.

What kind of action can be, without take place a certain Beginning, produced sometime?

It is precisely here that we must return to the basis of the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Consciousness which is defined by ensuring its Continuity and implicitly of the "Logical Continuum" precisely through the Tangentiability (the Finite) which attracts the Asymptotism (the Infinity) after it, for to be Continuous.

Even when we use the term "Continuum" it includes within it, both the Finite which Continues and the Infinite toward which it is Continued.

So just as when we determine the first Word - Matrix within the Universal Pure Language and now by the Motivation of the Intervention we cannot speak of an Intervention that occurs, because this does NOT occur but, only, is defined, because if we take the Intervention as being the Asymptotism we observe that the Finite or the Tangentiability is precisely the Lack, from the Intervention, what cannot define a production of the Intervention, but rather of the its Lack.

What Happens in the worlds developed by the Word -Matrix of the knowledge, on the base of the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, is precisely the fact that it is reflected through this Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, the inverse IMAGE of the Intervention namely, the inverse of the Lack of this Intervention which is precisely the Image of the Intervention itself, and to us, people, does not appear us the Lack of the Intervention defined thus by the Tangentiability, but it appears us the Image of the Intervention itself, and thus we consider that the Intervention exists as such.

No one can affirm or deny the existence or non-existence of the true Intervention at the level of the Intangible Forms, only that there, can be not known what namely is this intervention.

When Intervention was reflected eternally in the Infinite Semantic Mirror of the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge, it received the status as such determined by Asymptotism and not by the Tangentiability that is the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Lack of the Intervention, what allowed the Creator Factors and Unique Incidentally to INTERVENE !

The intervention is not its Lack, but its Lack is precisely the Finite, so the Tangentiability.

Within the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge was reflected the Tangentiability and by no means Asymptotism, which did not mean anything defined, because the Tangentiability as Lack of the Intervention represents the Finite, so "something" concrete that can be reflected within a Mirror.

This Mirror will render the inverse Image of the Lack of Intervention, which will consist exactly in the Intervention itself, being in fact the Asymptotism, the inverse of Tangentiability, so the Infinite.

This inversion of the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, on the Intervention as a result of its reflection within the respective Mirror determines: THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH.

The Intervention as Image reflected by the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite is in fact the Asymptotism and not the Tangentiability that was reflected for to give by the reversal of its Image, the Asymptotism, and, the full part of the "glass" the Finite or Tangentiability remaining outside the Image inverted by the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, so outside of the Asymptotism, or Absolute Truth, thus, the Intervention (Asymptotism) consists of Non-Intervention (Tangentiability) and Non-Intervention in Intervention, and Asymptotism (Intervention) represents the "Empty" toward us the people, and the Non-Intervention (Tangentiability) represents the "Full" through Finite, which determines the concrete, the form, the structure, the system.

Thus any Intervention in the worlds of Knowledge hides within its, the Infinity (the "Empty", Asymptotism) being the inverse image mirrored in the Semantic Mirror of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

the Knowledge of the Tangentiability (of Finite, Concrete, "Full", Form, System), so exactly the inverse of what it would be **Motivated** to do, to determine a particular product of its, or to finalize a certain action of it, what should be Finite.

This is the Absolute Truth within the framework developed by the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge.

**On the other hand, the Coaxiological Truth is the one that defines the Intervention without the intervention of the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge, where the Asymptotism and Tangentiability, so the Infinite and the Finite are Motivated, through the Logical Function, that precedes the Coxiological Truth, through parallelism and essentialization.**

Once the Coaxiological Truth defines the Intervention, it means that it Acknowledges and therefore Motivates the Intervention of the Intangible Forms, which are represented within the "Logical Continuum" by the Asymptotism that underlies the Logical Function together with the Tangentiability.

Even if the Asymptotism is represented through to be the "Empty", this "Empty" is just as necessary as the "Full" of Tangentiability, because if it were not the "Empty" (Asymptotism), it would not be, nor the "Full", Tangentiability, or Finite.

Because the Finite will always need the Infinite like the "Full" will need "Empty" in order to be determined and defined.

The "Full" will never be defined and nor will be determined through "Full", but through "Empty" like the Finite will never be defined and determined through Finite, but only through by Infinity, because if we determine the "Full" through "Full "and the Finite through Finite, the result would be null, because we cannot know what the Finite is if we cannot compare it with the Infinity, as we

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

will never know what is the “Empty” if we do not know the “Full”, as the immortals will never know that they are immortal if they do not know: Death, as never mortals will know that they are mortals if they do not know: Immortality.

We, human beings, always relate our own life to Immortality and where can we find true Immortality than in Death?

Nowhere else, because in Death, it will not be anymore, who to die, being: Dead!

What would be the opposite of the intervention?

Of course, the Non-Intervention.

I have previously said that Intervention, therefore, the Asymptotism, consists in Non-Intervention, therefore Tangentiability.

Once the Asymptotism is the Intervention and the cause is known, namely the Intangible Forms that have intervened through Asymptotism, then Tangentiability is Non-Intervention.

How namely to Intervene with what defines the Intervention respectively the Infinite, when for to Intervene it is necessary precisely the Finite, so the Concrete which to can determine another Concrete, or another Finite.

The Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge makes precisely this inversion necessary to be able to structuralize its worlds with the help of the Intervention, namely, it reverses the Image of the Intervention attributing her to the Finite and the Image of the Non-Intervention attributes her to the Infinite.

Thus any Intervention within the Word -Matrix, of the Knowledge, has its own product, a certain Concrete result, so Finite.

Why does the Concrete belong to the Finite and not the Infinite ?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

No matter how much we have defined the Infinite as being Concrete, we can do it of course, but, that Infinite will be concretized through endlessness and Asymptotism, as it cannot be a product, a result or something that will receive the concreteness of a Total definition, but only partial, remaining in the case of the Infinite, an eternal Unknown, and any Unknown has cut from the Concretization, defining her as Non-concrete.

Thus, the Finite is Concrete and the Infinite is Non-concrete.

The Asymptotism being Infinite is the Non-Concrete and Tangentiability being Finite is the Concrete.

It is seen how the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Word - Matrix of the Knowledge, reverses or transfers the Concrete from within the Finite and Tangentiability, represented through Non-Intervention, within the Infinite, thus of the Asymptotism represented by Intervention, and the Intervention passes on the side of the Finite, by inversion, which receives the status of Non-concrete, and the Infinite receives the status of Concrete, therefore, of Non-Intervention.

**Thus the Infinite (Asymptotism) in Knowledge becomes Concrete and Non-Intervention, and the Finite (Tangentiability) becomes Non-concrete and Intervention**, all due, again I repeat, to the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite from within the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge.

Therefore any Intervention of the human being belongs to the Finite who receives the status of Intervention in the Knowledge from the Infinite, although the Man has only the Illusion of Life that he Intervenes, because the Intervention of Man belongs in reality to the Infinite, and when the Man does Not Intervene, it is precisely then he Intervenes!

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Because any Non-Intervention that is Concrete at the Infinite, by the inversion of the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, in reality is Non-concrete, and any Intervention that appears to the Man as Non-concrete in the Knowledge, in reality is Concrete.

I wrote more about Intervention because it overlaps not only with the Word -Matrix of the Knowledge, but also with the Logical Function defined through the "Logical Continuum" which has as bases both the Asymptotism and Tangentiability.

"First" Intervention, we used quotation marks because we cannot know in this case what is first, second, third, etc., but not being another term, we can use it figuratively on this one.

Thus the first intervention would consist of the Asymptotism received from the Intangible Forms, about which I have written that reported to these Intangible Forms may or may not be Asymptotism, and can be spotted as anything else, not only, of to not be Asymptotism, but and of to have other and other meanings unknown to us.

To be or not to be a thing is valid for a Logic of the Logical Coefficient 2, but that thing can still have an infinity of meanings opposed to these to be or not to be, like good and evil can still have an infinity of other opposites of their.

The same can happen in the case of Asymptotism, and for this reason I strongly believe that for us, the people, appears us in quality of Asymptotism, so two straight lines that tend towards each other, but will never unite, precisely because we humans cannot conceive how it would be to think on the basis of more meanings or more opposites than these two, to be or not to be, or beautiful and ugly, or good and evil, etc., characteristics belonging to Logical Coefficient 2.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, is the Asymptotism an Intervention of Intangible Forms to define and determine the "Logical Continuum"?

So is the "Logical Continuum" a result of an Intervention?

If so, is this Intervention an Intervention of the Hazard or is it a Concrete and rational Intervention?

Hazard also has its Concreteness as well as the rational.

To talk about a planned Intervention of the Intangible Forms is as if you admit that, there, is a God who said: "Let's I send them and to these an Asymptotism to make them some worlds".

Well, things are not so, because to talk about a rational Intervention you should involve at least the Logical Function, if not the Knowledge to define "something" rational.

In order to involve the Logical Function, it must first of all to be determined.

Even if in this case we cannot talk about temporality, about the first or the last, about forward or backward, but we can to define a certain structure according to, determinants or determinated, an aspect of which I have written more extensively in the previous pages.

You cannot affirm that the Logical Function is a determinant of Asymptotism, because it is exactly inverse.

If, however, it is argued that the Asymptotism is a determinant of the Logical Function and of course of the "Logical Continuum" then it means that "Continuum Logic" is no longer "Continuum", because its own "Continuum" is lost in Asymptotism, because "Continuum" is an alternation between the Finite and the Infinite, between the Finished and the Endless, an alternation that cannot be defined as such in the case in which it would be

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

willing to determine the Asymptotism, because in this case the Finite should be removed from the equation and replaced with the Infinity, and, also, and the Tangentiability should be removed, thus, the whole picture would receive a nuance that tends towards its own cancellation, which is not absolutely suggestible at all.

Therefore the Intervention of Intangible Forms through Asymptotism is not an Intervention structured on its Fundamental Logic nor on any particular rationality.

*As for the Hazard, things get a bit complicated because it cannot be defined, neither through the Concrete, nor through the Non-concrete, because we can define Concretely that that one is a Hazard and through its meaning he is a Non-concrete.*

*Does the Hazard belong to the Non-concrete?*

*If the Hazard is highlighted to us as being Non-concrete, it means that according to the ones I have stated above, we humans attribute the Non-concrete to the Finite, due to the inversion of the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, which in reality should belong to the Infinite, so to the Intervention.*

*This aspect emphasizes us more than ever that fact the Hazard is an Intervention of Asymptotism, which of course belongs to the Infinite.*

*In conclusion, the Asymptotism, the Infinite and the Intervention mirrored by the Semantic Mirror of Knowledge appear as being the appanage of the Finite, and the Nonintervention, the Tangentiability and the Finite in the Semantic Mirror of the Knowledge appear as being the Infinite.*

*Thus, what Man considers as being Infinite is in fact the Non-mirrored Finite, and what Man considers as being Finite is, in fact the Non-mirrored Infinite.*

*The Infinite Non-mirrored in the Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge is: Intervention and Asymptotism,*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*and the Finite Non-mirrored is Nonintervention and Tangentiability.*

*The Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge does nothing but to reverse the attributes of the Infinite on which to transfer them to the Finite, and the attributes of the Finite to transfer them to the Infinite.*

*That is why Asymptotism is defined by Man as being the two straight lines that tend towards one another, but never unite, because Man looks, understands, feels, rationalizes, judges and contemplates Asymptotism through the Finite, precisely because of the inversion, instead of to feel him, to judge, contemplate, and rationalize through the Infinite, but precisely the feeling, the judgment and the reason of the Man is due to the Infinite Semantic Mirror of the Knowledge that creates the inversion.*

*When Man feels or rationalizes any aspect related to Infinity, it will be in reality an aspect related to Finite, and vice versa.*

*Looking at the starry vault of the night that is lost in the Infinity of its space, we actually see the grandeur of the Finite, and when we hit the obstruction of a Wall that seems to us a barrier in the way of our hopes and aspirations which want to overcome that wall, at that moment, really we hit us by Infinity.*

*For Man, the Infinite Non-mirrored Begins only where exists Termination, so Finite, like the Finite Non-mirrored, begins only where exists, Non-termination and Infinity.*

*In order to understand oneself, always the Man will have to look for the Infinite in the Finite and the Finite in the Infinite, like he will have to look for Hazard and Intervention in the Non-mirrored Infinite, and Predictability and Non-Intervention in the Non-mirrored Finite.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Predictability is the inverse of Hazard, that is, if through Hazard a thing or an element cannot be defined as a result of an Intervention through predictability that element can be defined.*

*Exactly as in the case of numbers at Lottery, where when Hazard intervenes you will not know what numbers will come out, and if the games are rigged, it is known what numbers will come out, the respective numbers being predictable, in advance.*

*The Intervention and the Hazard due to the inversion created by the Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge appears to Man as belonging to the Finite, because only a Concrete "something", which is the Finite in the human mind, can be a certain Intervention, as only a Concrete "something" can be submitted to a certain Hazard, not being able to understand that the Hazard does Not belong at all to the Finite defined by Man as being a "Concrete" something, but it belongs to the Infinite, which Man cannot define as being Concrete "something", because it is Infinite and he cannot to encompass the edges, not understanding that, in fact, precisely the Infinite is the one that gives Man the Concreteness of that "something", which has been previously mentioned, by the fact that the Infinite Non-mirrored holds the Intervention, and the Man is a being that thinks, dreams, feels, judges, reason, only and only, reported to the Intervention.*

*Whatever Man realizes during his life is an Intervention of his in the world that he thinks belongs to him and whose reality has the Illusion that he Knows it.*

*Man without Intervention would no longer be Man.*

*That is why Man identifies the Intervention with himself, attributing it to the essence of his own existence through the example "I did" or "I go" or "I think, I write, I count, I work, I work, I elaborate" and the list could endlessly with new and new verbs.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*If Man has not adjudicated for him, the Intervention, he would not Know the verb, and if he did not Know the verb, he would self-exclude himself from this world.*

*The question that arises is whether Man is really a Finite being or an Infinite being?*

*Once, he appropriates its Intervention and identifies with it, the Intervention Non-mirrored belongs to the Infinite, thus the Man identifies with the Infinite, therefore with the Hazard, and not with the Finite due to the inversion created by the Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge, through which always that "something" which intervenes must be identified with a Finite Concrete, both in the result of the Intervention and in the one that determines the Intervention.*

*The reality is totally inverse, that is, both the result of the Intervention and the determinant of the Intervention belong to the Infinite, and Man in quality of determinant of the Intervention belongs to the Infinite.*

*In this case, Man is an Infinite being, but whose reportings are made on the Finite so that he can justify the Intervention that appears to him inverted due to the Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge.*

*Once Man is an Infinite being, and this one is reported to the Finite for to justify his own existence, I wonder if the Finite is and can it be precisely a wall behind which to End the Everything or is it merely a milestone in defining the Infinite?*

*To talk about Finite that, is "something" that Ends , a point terminus, an End, is exactly as if you distort the Infinite by saying that the Infinite never Ends.*

*The Reality is totally inverse and not only due to the inversion of the Infinite Semantic Mirror of Knowledge, but especially due to the fact that can Not exist the Endless, such as can Not exist the End, because if we thought with a*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Logical Coefficient an Infinite, then the End would be identified with the Beginning, and the Beginning with the End and Everything would be reduced to a point, atemporal and without space, in a word, dimensionless, but which would include in it the whole range of Logical dimensions, or as I call them, of Logical Coefficients, that one could really deduce the fact that both the Beginning and the End are a dream that ends just as it arrived with the first rays of the day which appears at a new horizon of the time of our own life.*

*I know that it is difficult for many to understand how a certain vision can be realized, where the End or the Endless, is completely missing, but in Reality this vision is the one that opposes our own Illusion of Life.*

*In all this amalgam what remains and is of paramount importance is: Intervention, which in the Non-mirrored phase belongs to the Infinite, or to what we consider to be Infinite.*

*The Intervention is the one that defines the Finite finally through its own identity.*

*Through Intervention, we the people understand action, process or change, which we attribute them Illusory to the Finite, and which in our mind are the ones responsible for creating the Finite.*

*In reality, not only that is it not so, but things are totally the opposite, because the Intervention realizes Illusory the Finite, as I said before, instead, through that Finite is defined the Dream, which is the Illusion of Life.*

*To say that the Infinite surrounds the Finite is just as wrong as to say that the Finite surrounds the Infinite, because neither one nor the other is intercalated or clothed by the other, because in the Infinite it is not possible to be the Finite, how in the Finite it is not possible to be the Infinite, because if it were the Finite in the Infinite, the Infinite could not be Infinite, and vice versa, if it could be*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*the Infinite in the Finite, nor could the Finite be Finite, because it would hide, in him, the Infinite.*

*To claim that the two, the Finite and the Infinite, **cohabit**, separated from each other, is again an anomaly, because the Infinite cannot be delimited under any form of anything, especially by the Finite, because thus it would no longer be Infinite.*

*Thus, neither can the cohabitation of the two be possible, a fact which further strengthens our thesis by which neither one nor the other are but two constants that define the benchmarks of our own Dream of the Illusion of Life in the amalgam of dreams created by the Logical Coefficients.*

If the Coaxiological Logic does not recognize the Infinite and the Finite than as two benchmarks of the Illusion of Life or the Dream given by the Logic Coefficient 2, it means that all that remains to this Coaxiological Logic is to operate, according to the significance and attributes of the Infinite and the Finite which these receive within the logical developments created by Coaxiological Logic, and these are for the Infinite: Asymptotism, Intervention and Hazard and for the Finite: Tangentiability, Non-intervention and Predictability.

Thus, at the basis of this Coaxiological Logic are the six basic elements, namely Asymptotism, Intervention, Hazard, Tangentiability, Nonintervention and Predictability.

Therefore Asymptotism is an Intervention of the Intangible Forms, therefore it is Hazard, and Tangentiability is a Non-Intervention of the Intangible Forms, therefore it is a Predictability.

Certain Relationships are defined between Hazard and Predictability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*The Hazard is an intervention of the Intangible Forms as being the inverse of Predictability.*

*The Hazard defines the Asymptotism and the Intervention in its turn only in relation to Predictability, because without Predictability Hazard would not define the Intervention, being a Hazard of the Non-Intervention, therefore of the Tangentiability, being Predictable.*

*Only the Intervention determines the Unpredictable Hazard.*

*The Intervention cannot be Predictable because then it would no longer define the Unpredictable Hazard and opposed to Tangentiability.*

*The Intervention is Unpredictable, just like and the Hazard and is defined reported to Hazard precisely by its Predictability, only in relation to it, because if the Intervention were Unpredictable in relation to Hazard, it would No longer define him, because could not relate to it, because the Unpredictability consists in, non-reporting, or, random reporting.*

*A random reporting would mean and other random reportings of the Intangible Forms, and these reportings would develop, other, and other, systems similar to Intervention and Hazard, but which would be defined in the same or different way, which intervenes exactly according to the rule of the Hazard, namely, or is, Hazard, or is Predictable.*

*If the Intervention is Hazard and not, Predictability in relation to Hazard, it means that the Hazard cannot be Hazard reported to the Intervention, since the Intervention would merge with the Hazard into an unitary All, which would result that the Hazard is not the report defined by an Intervention, but it is an ubiquitous All, and this would not hide the Intervention within it.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

To define the Hazard without Intervention is as if you would support Tangentiability without Nonintervention, because the lack of Intervention would cancel the occurrence of Nonintervention, and thus Hazard and Predictability would unite, as well as Asymptotism with Tangentiability, because all these would be based on the lack of Intervention, but also of Nonintervention, and their "appearance" on this scene would be due to the Absurd.

But let us not forget, that and the Absurd is the result of an Intervention and everything that is not the result of an Intervention comes out, by cancellation, totally from the equation.

When I think of the Absurd I do not refer to the Absolute Absurd which is totally different from the usual Absurd and can be without any Intervention, determinant or anything else.

It can be without any other resultant of his.

Please pay close attention.

Hazard is Intervention, as well as Predictability is Non-Intervention, and both define the basis of Coaxiological Logic.

Any Intervention must to be determined by "something" as are the Intangible Forms in our case.

But the Intangible Forms are determined by that "something" in their turn?

What is the basis of the Intervention than another Intervention, just like the basis of the Hazard consists in the Intervention?

The Intervention has neither Beginning nor End, as well its basis cannot be determined, but it can be determined if it has a determinant or not, by the fact that any Intervention is by reporting to the Non-Intervention a Predictability, since the Predictability belongs to the Non-Intervention, as, any Intervention is by reporting to the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*Intervention a Hazard, because it belongs to the Intervention.*

*Why?*

*Because when the Intervention reports to the Nonintervention, it determines the defining of the Nonintervention, because, if it would not report itself to the Nonintervention, defining it, the Intervention itself would be canceled; the same it happens and in the case of the Nonintervention, which would cancel if it would not define the Intervention as such by which it can define itself, in turn.*

*This fact shows us the amazing thing, namely another INVERSION, different from the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Knowledge, Inversion caused to other causes, but which Intervenes in the form of Intervention within the Asymptotic-Tangential system, respectively of Intervention and Non-intervention, Hazard and Predictability.*

*Thus the Intangible Forms are determined by us as being the inversion of the bases of the "Logical Continuum" and of the Logical Function.*

*Thus, any Hazard is a Nonintervention reported to an Intervention, as any Predictability is an Intervention reported to a Nonintervention.*

*Therefore, an Intervention is a reporting to Hazard and Nonintervention, just as any Nonintervention is a reporting to Predictability and Intervention.*

*Thus, the Intervention is determined by Hazard and Non-Intervention, and the Non-Intervention, by Predictability and Intervention.*

*What was "before," Predictability and Intervention to define the Nonintervention, or Nonintervention and Hazard to define the Intervention?*

*If it had been the Nonintervention and the Hazard to define the Intervention, it means that the Intervention*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

is a Hazard of the Nonintervention, but and, this Hazard should have been determined by "something" together with its Nonintervention, because we cannot talk about the Nonintervention as long as we can not report it to the Intervention.

If it had been the Intervention and the Predictability to define the Nonintervention it means that the bases of the "Logical Continuum" focus on the Nonintervention, but to consider that they are so is as if you admit that another Intervention Predictable this time, has determined the Nonintervention, being in fact the same thing if we think about Intervention.

In conclusion, once the Intervention is defined on all levels, it means that the Nonintervention and the Hazard have determined the Intervention and Predictability, which in her turn has determined the Nonintervention.

In this way we reach at a system of the Intervention – Nonintervention – Intervention – Nonintervention type, which thus continues to endlessly.

However, despite the fact that this system continues in this way, due in particular to the Logical Coefficient 2, based on which, we ration, we must not make the mistake of claiming "before" of, Asymptotism, so of Hazard, as being an Intervention, because it has been demonstrated that at the basis of this intervention consisted, precisely the Hazard and Nonintervention, which can define a new Intervention only if the Intervention was, somewhere within the respective string, defined.

Therefore, if we consider that the Intervention has not been defined, this means that at the basis of the Intervention is the Hazard and the Non-Intervention, without including with them the Infinity or Asymptotism, because they are the result of an Intervention.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**And the Nonintervention is a kind of Intervention.**

Finally, we could attribute the Hazard and Nonintervention precisely to the Intangible Forms, but which, once defined, they can no longer be attributed to Hazard and Nonintervention, because they are defined as such, even though these are Intangible.

Even Intangibility is a definition, and to attribute the Hazard to the Intangibility is as if you claim that and this one is an effect of a cause of Hazard what implies Hazard Intervention, therefore the Intangible Forms are not subject to Nonintervention of Hazard, but to the Intervention of Hazard.

Thus, the Non-intervention of the Hazard belongs to a "something before" by the Intangible Forms, and that "before" can be taken as a Cause of the Intangible Forms, although even the term of Cause is as incorrect as the one of "before", because a cause involves an Event or a phenomenon, a thing or an Intervention of "something", whereas if when that Intervention does not exist, it means that it does not exist neither the Cause.

In my previous writings I attributed the Cause only to the developments determined by the Word - Matrix, of the Knowledge, because only there, can be the Primordial Event, but also the succession of events, that defines the Phenomenon as such.

Next we can assign the term of Cause by enlarging its competence and to any Intervention of any kind, even if the Event or the Phenomenon is missing.

In case the Event or the Phenomenon is missing, can we speak of a Cause in the true Meaning of the word?

Of course not, because any cause occurs due to an Event.

But, the Intervention is not an Event?

The Intervention becomes an Event that precedes an entire succession of events only within the Word -Matrix of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Knowledge and nowhere else, thus, the Intervention that we know is not in the least, that one we use in the reporting to Non-Intervention, Asymptotism, Tangentiality, Hazard, Concrete and Nonconcrete.

The difference of this Intervention in relation to the Intervention within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge is precisely what I have previously said that is missing the Event which to determine her as such.

We people are accustomed due to our limited way of thinking to assign always to the Intervention, the status of Event, because through each Intervention in our mind we know that "something" happens and that is why we associate her with the Happening that comes to us as a disjunctive functionality upon the attributive functionality of the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.

This fact determines us to Understand that and the Happening of the Event is Unique if it defines a single Event.

This whole way of thinking reflects the artifices of the Illusion of Life, the artifices that have generated us and continue to generate a whole series of errors.

**No, the Intervention** is not an Event in itself, than in our minds, because to be an Event as I have written in other books of mine, it is necessary to be realized more things, namely, it must first of all to be determined as a Lack from a "something", and that Lack is the Lack which emerges once with its Event in the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.

This Lack has No way to overcome the Word -Matrix of Knowledge, because it would be in its turn in the Word -Matrix of the Creation, then, in the one of the Origin, in, Beginning and in End, having no way to transcend through the attributive functions within other Words -Matrices.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

If this transcending were to be realized, thinking on the other side of the problem, then the Lack would no longer have any attribution than a possible disjunctivity based on Unicity and Happening, but to be Unique and Incidentally in relation to other and other Words -Matrices, with different functionalities, is, to attribute to the Lack other, and other definitions, and not, that one, of Event.

Assuming that we could assign and the definition of Event, the Lack would become an Event amorphous and Lacked, by its own Lack, precisely because the Lack as such is an area of the attribution of the other Words -Matrices from the Attributive group.

Therefore a Lack without its own content becomes a Lack of the Lack, so in no way can it be an Event, because if we called it as being an Event, this Event would be Lacked by its own Significance, so by the Event as such.

Thus, we cannot speak of the Event than within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge, like we can not speak of the Lack than within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.

Even if by extrapolation we attribute the Lack to the other Words -Matrices within those with attributive functions, it would not be the Lack that we know, because such a Lack would be lacked by its own Knowledge, because it would no longer be defined as being a Lack from the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite, and not being a Lack from it, the Lack could no longer be defined as being a Lack that we Know.

Attributed to Creation, respectively to the Word -Matrix of Creation, we could define an Unknown Lack, but this Unknown Lack is transmitted to the Word -Matrix of Knowledge through the attribution of the Word -Matrix of Creation to Knowledge, which consists precisely in the Semantic, which in the Knowledge becomes the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

To attribute the Lack to the Origin is improper, because the Word-Matrix Origin by its Lack could be precisely the inverse of the Origin, but even so, a Lack can be defined as being the inverse of another Lack.

If it were the inverse of another Lack, it means that the Beginning would become precisely that Lack, whose inverse would be the Origin, if we know that the Group of the Words -Matrices with attributive functions is the End, the Beginning, the Origin, the Creation and the Knowledge.

If the true Lack would be that of the Beginning, and the Origin would be the inverse of the Lack of the Beginning it would mean that the Origin is and the Lack of the Lack of the Beginning, which would mean that and the Lack of the Beginning would have to be determined by another Lack, according to the functional attributive determinations of Words -Matrices, and this Lack would have been "generated" by the End as being again the inverse of the Lack of the Beginning whose inverse is the Origin, whose inverse is in Creation whose inverse is in Knowledge, which denotes that the Lack would begin once with the Word -Matrix, the End.

Lack is and a determinant of the attributive function, because the Lack is an attribute of Creation bestowed on Knowledge.

To claim the beginning of Lack once with the Word -Matrix the End is as if you claim that attribution does not stop here, but it occurs to infinity from infinity.

Even if we were to accept and this position, what, could occur from the End, than a new Beginning?

That Beginning we have as an attribution of the End, precisely in the group of Words - Matrices with attributive functions.

If we define Lack as "coming" from outside the group of attributive, then we should define her as having

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

another Beginning, and that Beginning will be the one which Begins with the End in the group of attributive.

Why begins the Beginning with the End in the group with attributive functionality I have written in other books of mine, but in short I will answer, precisely because the End is eternal a new Beginning, and the Beginning is eternal a new End.

In this case the End that would determine the Lack in which it would "begin" the Lack would actually be the result of another Beginning different from the Word - Matrix, Beginning.

According to Coaxiology, there can Not be two identical Words -Matrices within the Universal Pure Language, because they would be defined by the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness as being one and the same Word once with the reporting of these Words -Matrices to the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

However much we would like to prove that the number 2, or 7, or 125 are actually two or seven or one hundred and twenty-five numbers, they are and remain only one number, respectively 2, 7, and 125.

If we divide, multiply, subtract, or add, they will give other numbers, which none of these will no longer be able to be ever 2, 7, 125.

The same thing happens and within the Universal Pure Language where each Word -Matrix is defined precisely through its uniqueness by the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness to which the Universal Pure Language is reported, thus defining the "Logical Continuum".

Therefore, there can Not be two or more Beginnings and neither two or more Ends, how there cannot be two or more Words -Matrix with name of Beginning, how there cannot be two or more Words -Matrix with name of End.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus, with the End, Lack can Not be defined as being a Lack from the End of another Beginning that would be located somewhere outside the Words -Matrices from the group of those with attributive functionality.

*In this case the End is Unique and the Beginning of the Beginning at the same time, just like the Beginning is the End of the End, and both define each other through the Beginning and the End, defining the Origin, whose attribute consists in Creation where is perfected the Lack, that will be sent to Knowledge by Creation through its attributive that is the Semantic, which became in Knowledge, the Semantic Mirror of the Infinite of Knowledge, where it will spring in Its fullness, the Lack, which is the true Cause and the Primordial Event that will perfect the succession of events, and with it the Phenomenon.*

*Thus the "Infinite Continuum" defined by the Universal Pure Language, the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness as well as the "Logical Continuum" are not based on succession of non-events, because each new Word -Matrix is Not and a new Event, because the Event is born only in the development of the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.*

*The Lack belongs as I have said only to the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, so the Intervention can Not under any form be a Lack of Non-Intervention, and the Non-Intervention to be a Lack of another Intervention, just like the Intervention cannot be a Beginning of the Lack, just like the Non-intervention an End of it.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **The Determinants and Basic Indeterminants**

*At the base of the Everything until this moment I have established that is the Non-Intervention and the Hazard.*

*Is the Hazard itself a kind of Intervention but different from the Intervention that generates the Order and the Predictability?*

*We observe how we gradually return on some levels similar to the ones I was at the beginning of my philosophical creation, when I was writing "Coaxialism", respective, to Order and Disorder, with the difference that now Order and Disorder are no longer attributed only to the development of the Word-Matrix of the Knowledge, but appear to us in another form long "before" the determination of this Word-Matrix, I put in quotation marks "before", because it cannot be about such terms rather than to use them to facilitate our way of understanding.*

*Thus the Order can be attributed to Intervention and Predictability, and the Disorder can be attributed to Hazard and Non-Intervention.*

*It is wrong to claim that the Non-Intervention would be the one which alongside the Hazard would define*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*the Intangible Forms, because these Intangible Forms had to be determined by "something", so, and they are the result of a certain Intervention.*

*We cannot attribute the Hazard or Non-Intervention as being, the Origin of these Intangible Forms.*

*They are probably Intangibles, only to us, the people who, we cannot think of so as to determine them as such in their true Meaning.*

*Even the definition of Form implies the Word - Matrix, the Form, which is part of the Universal Pure Language.*

*Even when the Meaning and Symbol of these Intangible Forms are different from the Word-Matrix, the Form, as happens in the case of the Logic, where the Logical Function or the "Logical Continuum" is different from the Word -Matrix, Logic.*

*As I said even and in the case in which the Word - Matrix, Form, is different from the Form belonging to the Intangible Forms, these Forms have a Beginning of them, because they have been determined by our mind even by undefinition or indeterminacy, same a certain form of determination is called.*

*Any Form implies within it a system with a certain structurality.*

*Even if there are Forms that do not imply a certain system or a certain structurality, this means that, even in this case, precisely because they do not imply a certain system which to define a certain structurality are Forms which exist precisely through this special feature of theirs and in this case they are called, the same, Forms.*

*Admitting also the third possibility, in which to not imply no system and no structurality and, above all, to not imply, not at least, the Lack of any system or structurality,*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*they would be, the same, Forms, because any Non-Involvement consists in another Involvement, just as any Involvement consists in another Non-Involvement.*

*Does this aspect define the Intangible Forms as belonging to a Lack?*

*No, this can not be known, I have determined why.*

*But if we admit this, absurdly, it still cannot be possible, because the term of Form that I have assigned by putting all three possibilities of undefinition- definition of its, falls under the incidence of the fact that the Lack must be Created, and the Creation belongs to the group of Words -Matrices with Attributive Functionalities which is not the problem in our case, once we have assigned these Intangible Forms as being "located" outside the Universal Pure Language, localization that can not have no tangency with the Words -Matrices of the group of the five with attributive functions.*

*What exactly, are these Forms?*

*Do they belong in a way, to a certain Intervention?*

*And the Intervention is, the same, as the Logic, respectively the Logical Function, which differs as and the Word -Matrix in relation to what the Logic means, in the quality of Logical Function, fact which occurs and on the Intervention.*

*Can Intervention be defined through Chaos, Hazard or, precisely by Non-intervention?*

*Intangible Forms are defined, therefore, they can not be a Non-Intervention than to the extent that this Non-Intervention is the resultant of an Intervention that defines it as such.*

*The Hazard compared to Predictability defines an Impossible Predictability, so "something" that appears without we "knowing" that will appear.*

*Predictability is defined as and the Hazard as being two possibilities by which it can intervene, so they*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*can be determined and as a result can be the resultant of Intervention, as can be the resultant of Non-intervention, because both Hazard and Predictability can also be in the position of to appear precisely due to a Non-Intervention that has thus caused an Intervention.*

*The Hazard and Non-Intervention actually define a Non-Intervention which stands next to a possible Intervention through Hazard?*

*The answer is affirmative, according to the example above, which means that if we go back to the Hazard and the Non-Intervention about which we discussed in the pages above, we get to define them as a Non-Intervention of another Intervention that becomes an Intervention, and the Hazard determined precisely by the Non-Intervention of another Intervention is and him in its turn an Intervention.*

*However, the Hazard is not Chaos, because it can be a perfectly Predictable Hazard reported to another Landmark, just as Predictability can be perfectly Unpredictable, so subject to Hazard, reported to another reference system.*

*Moreover, Intervention can be defined both through Hazard or Predictability, just as the Non-Intervention, by the same Hazard or Predictability.*

*This sends us to the Chaos.*

*Is the Chaos the resultant of an Intervention or the resultant of a Non-Intervention?*

*Both the Chaos and Order can be the resultant of an Intervention, like they can be and the resultant of a Non-Intervention.*

*Therefore what was at the "origin" of the first determined and which was the determinant, the Intervention or the Non-Intervention?*

*If we claim that the Intervention, this means that this Intervention was determined by "something" which*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*automatically implies a determinant and thus, and that determinant would have another determinant in its turn and the chain of the Intervention in quality of determinant could continue at Endless, like the Non-Intervention if it has a determinant, it means that and that one has in its turn another determinant and thus, the series of the determinants of the Non-Intervention could continue and these, like the one of the Intervention, at Endless.*

*Finally, we come to the Determinants of Intervention and Non-Intervention.*

*How, exactly can these Determinants be?*

*If they are Determinants it means that their "origin" is endless, so the Intervention is Endless and, therefore, any Intervention can Not be Unique.*

*Here, again, they hit each other, because the Endlessness consists in Uniqueness and therefore the Endless Intervention should be Unique, because if it were not Unique, it should be, Ended, and therefore to be only in this case determined by "something".*

*This Intervention that appears to us as being a succession based on determinants is endless through the successive way by which it unfolds to us, and by no means by her self where each Intervention is defined to us as being Finite.*

*Again, things deny each other, because we can not speak of succession than within the succession of events developed by the Word -Matrix of Knowledge, fact exemplified by me in the pages above.*

*This fact complicates things even more, since it is not a succession, we cannot speak of determinants which follow one another from the point of view of events through the Intervention, so that the Intervention to become an Event and by successions the respective event*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*to receive the title of Phenomenon, which includes a succession of Events within it.*

*Not being able to speak about a determinant in the case of the Intervention which to be and Phenomenon it means that the Intervention can Not be defined as being based on another Intervention than to the extent that this one is an Non-Intervention, and the Non-Intervention cannot be defined as being based on another Non-Intervention unless this is an Intervention, and so we return from where we left, namely to Determinants.*

By the example above with the Event and the respective Phenomenon with the succession, it means that the Intervention as well as the Non-Intervention even though they are Endless, can be defined as being sequential only due to the fact that any Intervention is based on Non-Intervention, just as any Non-Intervention is based on Intervention.

Thus no Intervention can not be an Event through the Non-Intervention that determines it, just as any Non-Intervention cannot be an Event precisely through the Intervention that determines it, *thus they becoming sequential but not successive, because successionality implies events and can only be performed within the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.*

*The Intervention - Non-Intervention, and Non-Intervention - Intervention report, highlights the fact that each Intervention involves Non-Intervention, as well as each Non-Intervention involves Intervention, as well as each Chaos may thus involve the Order and each Order may involve Chaos.*

*The determinant of Intervention will be eternal the Non-intervention, as well as the determinant of Non-intervention will be eternal the Intervention.*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*To say that "before" was the Intervention is just as false with saying that it was, the Non-Intervention.*

*However, and one but and the other, are two determinants?*

*As hard as it begins, to we go on with the deductions, these are two determinants, because they are eternally determined on each other, and each such determinant consists precisely in its inverse, therefore in its indeterminacy, so we can deduce that, the Basic Determinants, as I call them in this moment are determinants that consist in their own Indeterminants.*

*Thus the Basic Determinants can be classified by their name, respectively: Basic Determinants of Intervention and Basic Determinants of Non-Intervention, of the Previous Indeterminant, according to their mode, respectively Basic Determinants Differentials, Sequential Basic Determinants (the source of the "Logical Continuum"), as well as the Basic Determinants of Report.*

*All of these Basic Determinants have correspondences in, the Causal Basic Indeterminants, of Connecting and the Causal Basic Indeterminants of Interdetermination.*

***The Basic Determinants of Intervention and the Basic Determinants of Non-Intervention, of the Previous Indeterminant***

Intervention in quality of Basic Determinant defines the Non-intervention.

As both are determinants and they can be the predecessors of the Intangible Forms, and these Forms in turn are the predecessors of the "Logical Continuum" it

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

means that these Basic Determinants are dual, because they are mutually determined by each other.

This duality determines the sequentiality, so, the plurality of the Intangible Forms.

Any Intervention consists of Non-Intervention as well as any Non-Intervention consists of Intervention.

It is precisely this interrelation that determines the sequentiality which is not the "Continuum", but will define him in turn because any sequentiality denotes plurality, and any plurality within the Intangible Forms defines the "Logical Continuum", because the plurality of the Intangible Forms is alternated with the Tangentiability of the Logical Function that defines this "Logical Continuum".

That is why one can speak of both the Logical Function and the "Logical Continuum", because even though they are identical from the point of view of the "Logical Continuum", they are not and from the point of view of the Logical Function, because the Logical Function precedes both the "Logical Continuum" as well as the Coaxiological Truth, even though these in turn are defined through the Logical Function.

However, the question arises, what preceded the Intervention, but the Non-Intervention, and how were they determined, because any Intervention must be determined in turn by "something", as well as any Non-Intervention must also be determined by "something", because there would be no Intervention without another precedent, just as there would be no Non-Intervention.

It can be said that Non-Intervention is just a simple state and that once it is Non-Intervention, it is possible that this one to not be determined in its turn by absolutely nothing.

My answer is categorical: **NO!**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Any Non-Intervention is not for nothing a Non-Intervention, as any Nothing is not for nothing, Nothing, both must relate to "something", so that the Non-Intervention, to be Non-Intervention, as the Nothing, to be Nothing.

In this case we can imagine a Determinant that has a precedent in an Indeterminant.

Can we admit that that Indeterminant is not determined in its turn?

Not! We cannot admit this, because any Indeterminant must in turn relate to "something" compared to which it is Indeterminant.

All we can admit is to refer ourselves to a Previous Indeterminant which to be not determined by absolutely no other determinant and nor to be not reported to this other determinant.

This aspect demonstrates us, that not even, that *Previous Indeterminant* does **NOT** "exist" as such, once it is **NOT** reported.

However, at this level Existence does not "exist", as well as no other opposites of it.

However, let us admit the Previous Indeterminant as being the Absolute of Everything and All only that here it is no longer possible to talk about Everything from the Back of Everything, because neither Everything is not reported to this Previous Indeterminant, only that through, the desire for comparison and blind reporting we can actually use this non-existent Everything.

Everything exists as I said only when it is reported to "something" compared to which this is Everything, not to mention the Everything from the Back of the Everything, where intervenes as rapporteur the Everything, respectively the "Infinite Continuum" in relation to his Back, defined by the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness which in their turn define the "Logical

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Continuum" defined and this one in turn by the Logical Function, which is defined by correlating Asymptotism with Tangentiability, Asymptotism defined by Intangible Forms, which have a precedent in Intervention and Non-Intervention, in Chaos and Disorder, in Hazard and Predictability.

Thus the Previous Indeterminant is a, non-reporting, but which in turn determines the Differentiability, which is a reporting to itself, through itself and for itself.

At the level of the Differentiability of the Previous Indeterminant we cannot speak of Thinking nor of Logic in any form, because any logical process begins by reporting Asymptotism to Tangentiality, what in this case the problem does not pose.

However, as I said before, those who think about such issues are us.

We people can report these things only through Asymptotism and Tangentiality, because we judge on the basis of Logical Coefficient 2.

If we were to judge on the basis of the Logical Coefficient one billion, next to Asymptotism and Tangentiality would be a billion minus two opposites of Asymptotism and Tangentiability, which means that the Logical Function has a much more complex root compared to what we can know, only that it becomes a strain, only when Tangentiability appears, and this one appears completely within Logical Coefficient 2 as being the true known compared to the unknown of Asymptotism that defines Infinity, namely the Infinite Logical Coefficient by which we humans cannot judge.

At the level, of, Previous Indeterminant, the same thing happens, namely the fact that we, humans, can determine it only through reporting to "something", and that "something" will always be an

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

opposite of the Previous Indeterminant, opposite, rapporteur compared to this one.

If we were thinking based on the Infinite Logical Coefficient, the Previous Indeterminant would have an infinity of opposites, therefore, of rapporteurs towards it, thus determining it, to possess the same infinity of rapporteurs of the rapporteurs to which it was reported, or compared to which the reporting is carried out.

This means that by means of the Logical Function, the Previous Indeterminant is defined as being Differential.

Through Differentiability is understood the infinity of rapporteurs compared to which the Previous Indeterminant it can report on itself.

Thus Differentiability is defined to us as being a distant root of the Logical Function before the Intangible Forms, fact which denotes that Differentiability is the mother of the Logical Function, and through this one occurs within the Logical Coefficient 2, Tangentiability, or other "Truths", such as, Tangentiability within other Logical Coefficients, but where the number of these "Truths" is according to the number of the Logical Coefficient minus ONE, which is always the part of the Infinite Logical Coefficient to which is reported.

I used "Truths" in quotation marks because these are the basis of Truths in each Logical Coefficient, because Coaxiological Truth based on Logical Coefficient 2 is defined, as having the root, in reporting Asymptotism to Tangentiability once with the parallelism of Logical Function, and of course, of the Tangentiability.

The root of Coaxiological Truth is Tangentiability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

All the Truths of the other Logical Coefficients will be defined, having their roots in the number of the Logical Coefficient minus One, which is the number of the Infinite, as is the Asymptotism in this case.

For an example within the Logical Coefficient 7, will be subtracted ONE, the number of a possible Asymptotism, and this will report itself to six opposites, among which one of these might be Tangentiability.

Thus the Previous Indeterminant is Differential by reporting to the Logical Function.

This fact determines its Sequential quality, which is the root of the "Continuum".

On the other hand we could think and vice versa that is, only we people thus see the Previous Indeterminant as being Differential and Sequential because it is seen by us by means of a reporting through us.

If the reporting through us were not defined, by us, then the Previous Indeterminant would no longer be a Differential and Sequential Indeterminant due to the differentiation, but would become an Indeterminate depending on the one making the reporting to it.

Considering such an assumption true, even by the fact that there can be more rapporteurs compared to the Previous Indeterminant, it means that each one will give him another characteristic and implicitly another appearance, which results in the same thing, only viewed from a different angle, namely: Differentiability.

Another possibility would be to admit that the Previous Indeterminant would not have rapporteurs as, in reality, it is probably happening, because it is the Precedent more than of the Everything and All together.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

In this case, the quality of Differentiability denoting the Sequentiality is not lost, on the basis of which we can admit, that the "Logical Continuum" is developed finally, and through Differentiability: the Logic?

Differentiability is the root of the Logic, and Sequentiality the root of the "Continuum", but until we get to define in more detail how they report to define the Logic and "Continuum", to we answer the last question, namely, without any reporting can we still talk about Differentiability and Sequentiality?

Apparently NO!

We cannot talk about Differentiability and Sequentiality without rapporteurs and of course the reportings of these rapporteurs.

In this case, what I say here becomes only half valid?

The answer is NO!

NO, it is only half valid, because the Previous Indeterminant even when NOT defined as such through reporting or through other known or unknown possibilities to human judgment, we resort to the following suggestions that we can take as subterfuges: "We are here", so we are reportable to the Previous Indeterminant and once we know we are and this is, going along the path of structuralist reportings until we reach its level.

Thus the Previous Indeterminant does NOT exist only if we do NOT exist!

A second subterfuge would be that whatever is Indeterminant can be defined by determination or NOT!

Even when defined through Indeterminacy, Determination springs from it, and therefore defines: Differentiability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The last subterfuge is: No opposite could not exist if it were not the Differential Previous Indeterminant, because in the Lack of Differentiability the opposites would lose its significance.

All these can help us in this demonstration, but they are not the demonstration we expect, because they are just simple subterfuges as I said before, because in this equation we have to do abstraction completely by ourselves.

Any opposite, our life, absolutely Everything is based on Differentiability.

What exactly determined this Differentiability in case there is no reporting towards it, but reporting that actually consists precisely in this Differentiability, in fact what exactly ignited the "first spark" of the first reporting?

The answer consists precisely in Non-Reporting, but and the Non-Reporting is as such, due, also, to another Reporting? Yes! Then?

We cannot use neither the Logical Coefficients nor the Infinite Logical Coefficient because it is not about any Logic at this level, then what is it?

If it were a Will, this would have to be subjected to a Logical structuralization, which is not the case.

If it was a Miracle, this would have a cause that would lie in a determinant, what is not the case again.

If it were a Collapse of the Previous Indeterminant in he himself, it should again be determined by "something", what again is not the case.

If there is nothing, then it means that it is NOT, neither the Previous Indeterminant, and if it is not the Precedent it means that it is NOT, neither the antecedent and nor the continuation, and precisely the fact that these are not, it means again that they are and thus we're going in a vicious circle.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**How can we get out of here?**

Many will try to find all kinds of fanciful solutions, but all are merely reportings to this vicious circle, and by no means non-reportings in self, which could no longer consist in any reporting.

And yet, was the human mind made so that it could not come out of this impasse in any form?

Many are invoking God at this time, and with this, they have solved everything because their own inability to reason and judge in more detail intervenes.

Many times I would like to give them justice because this is how I get rid of this tormenting and disturbing demonstration for which many philosophers, like myself, did not sleep many nights.

And yet, I do not want to escape easily, by giving all the hardship to the God who solves them all.

We humans need a coherent Logic and not one that is always solved by our powerlessness, where a supernatural character intervenes who makes them and knows them all, but it tells us nothing, than, what we know and knew for a long time.

God exists only in his capacity as a Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally, which is formed much more "later" on another level much different from the level we are now.

Returning to the tormenting question of the Previous Indeterminant and to the fact, how this one may be in the case of Non-Reporting, I return to its own definition, namely, of Previous Indeterminant.

To be Indeterminant does not mean that it is not Determined by "something" but to be Previous means the fact that it precedes "something", and by this precedence it reports to that "something".

To remove, the term Previous from the definition, remaining only the term Indeterminant is

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

equivalent to not recognizing to him the merit of being where other Indeterminants or determinants are not.

Thus by the notion itself of Indeterminant, we do not define nor can we define a total Indeterminant, because then this one would no longer be Indeterminant, not having to what, to report itself.

This fact means that both the Determinant and the Indeterminant are two opposites.

Being two opposites, are a reporting.

To speak of Indeterminant or Determinant as not being, opposed, is as if the Determinant is Indeterminant, and the Indeterminant, Determinant.

This implies that the Previous Indeterminant should be defined above all: the Indeterminant - Determinant Precedent, where the Precedent from terminology to be put only in the figurative mode and not in the proper way, because any term of precedent is a reporting.

Thus the Indeterminant -Determinant Previous, would be an Absolute Non-Reporting.

Absolute Non-reporting, totally excludes any notion of Indeterminant or Determinant, because each one cancels reciprocally the other one.

Thus, the name of the Indeterminant-Determinant would be a purely figurative one, so I propose to let the first which seems at least more suggestive, but also easier to remember, namely the Previous Indeterminant.

I repeat it is a totally figurative name, because at this level we cannot speak under any form of Indeterminants or Determinants, because each one should to be reported to "something".

Even when I tried to "match" the Indeterminant with the Determinant, the two, even if they would cancel, are the opposite, and, so, reporting.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**In order to solve the problem we will have to completely make abstraction of opposites, but also of anything that might mean a certain reporting and thus, look at absolutely everything with exigency.**

**What can this Previous Indeterminant be?**

**First of all, can it be Misunderstood?**

**Not! Because if it were Misunderstood, it would report to its opposite.**

**Can it be a Symbol, Understood, or anything else that could define a Word, but which, to be defined differently than all the Words -Matrices of Universal Pure Language?**

**NOT! Because then it would be reporting.**

**Can it be an Expression?**

**Not, because it should, to report itself.**

**Then what is the Previous Indeterminant?**

**THE NON-REPORTING OF THE REPORTING AND THE REPORTING OF THE NON-REPORTING, ALSO, THE INFINITY OF OPPOSITES OF THESE REPORTINGS AND NON-REPORTINGS WHICH REDUCE TO THE ABSOLUTE - ABSURD!**

**THE PREVIOUS INDETERMINANT IS THE SELF OF THE ABSOLUTE - ABSURD.**

**Basic Determinants Differentials and Sequential  
Basic Determinants**

It is observed how the Self of the Absolute -Absurd is the one who through the Logical Coefficient 2, so in our view, it is responsible for Differentiability by means of the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Precedent Indeterminant which defines the Absolute - Absurd, but in the equation with the reporting, this becomes as functional definition of his, the Previous Indeterminant, reported to the Determinations but also to the "subsequent" Indeterminations that take place.

The reporting of the Precedent Indeterminant to any other reporting, determines the Differentiability which, although it is part of the Self of this Precedent Indeterminant, becomes an independent Determinant in relation to all other reportings.

Differentiability has its root in the Self of the Absolute -Absurd where it receives the Differential quality precisely through the eternal reduction of the Absolute to the Absurd and the Absurd to the Absolute!

This reduction is defined through Differentiability but also through the Self-state which is a Fulfilled state in Itself, which denotes a Differentiation towards the Self, through Self and for Self.

This Differentiation defines in turn the Sequentiality which is another Basic Determinant, which lies at the basis of the "Continuum" in the reportings identified by the infinity of Logical Coefficients of Knowledge.

It is worth noting that, no Logical Coefficient can not be found outside the Word -Matrix of Knowledge except strictly in the developments made by this Word - Matrix.

The Logical Coefficients are totally different from the Word - Matrix, the Logic, compared to the Logical Function or the "Logical Continuum", therefore the respective remark must be made.

In conclusion, the Differential Basal Determinant is the root of what will be defined as the Logical Function, because it is also the root of the Reporting which becomes implicitly and the root of the Logical Function, and the Sequential Basal Determinant becomes the root of the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

"Continuum", regardless, that it is about the "Infinite Continuum" or "the Logical Continuum".

**The Basic Determinants of Report**

They are defined by the Differential Basic Determinants, but also by the Sequential Basic Determinants together, thus having a dual, differential-sequential quality, which makes them to define the characteristics within the development of certain reportings.

Through the differential part, the reporting is defined compared to another reporting, and the type of definitions can be infinite, and through the sequential part, the reporting is defined only from a strictly sequential point of view, without being able to be an infinity of other reportings.

For example, one is a reporting through which is differentiated the rapporteur compared to other rapporteur by an infinite number of possibilities, and the other is a reporting through which the rapporteur is reported only through certain sequential reportings, which are not in their entirety, but only in their partiality.

This is also the difference between Differential and Sequential.

An intervention of the Basic Determinants of Report is and by means of the Intangible Forms upon the Logical Function, defining her as such through the Differential quality of the Asymptotism reported to the Sequential quality of the Tangentiability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**The Causal Basic Indeterminants, of Connecting,  
and the Causal Basic Indeterminants of  
Interdetermination**

This category of Indeterminants is defined as a response to the Basic Determinants, by which they are defined and identified at the same time, establishing causal relations of Interdetermination between the Basic Determinants.

These relationships are the basis of what the connecting between the "Logical Continuum", the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness and the "Infinite Continuum" can mean, within the framework determined by the Coaxiological Logic.

Without Connecting or Interdetermination the entire Logic would lose its backbone which, at least from the point of view of Logical Coefficient 2, is based on these two auspices.

Any reporting is done through a Relationing or Interdetermination, because any Determination has in its self a root that defines a true string of other Determinations, which leads that at each reporting between two or more Determinations with Indeterminations, Indeterminations with Indeterminations, Determinations with Determinations to be made and an Interdetermination as a result of these relationings, due to the Determinations or Indeterminations that are in the roots of the respective Determination or Indetermination which implicitly leads to an Interdetermination between several Determinations or other Indeterminations "hidden" in, the root of the respective Determination or Indetermination.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

In conclusion, the Relationing takes place only between Determinations or Indeterminations directly and not between their roots.

The reporting between *the roots* of these Determinations, or Indeterminations which, in their turn, are a series of Determinations or Indeterminations, in their turn, is called Interdetermination.

\*

In conclusion, one of the most important characteristics underlying the Logical Function and respectively the "Logical Continuum that defines it is parallelism.

It is also the basis of the Determinants and Indeterminants.

By parallelism I do not necessarily mean inversion or change of meaning of an element that is parallel compared to another element.

Concerning parallelism, I have also written that it becomes one of the main characteristics of Coaxiological Logic, respectively of Logical Function, which defines Coaxiological Truth as being a Truth as a resultant of the parallelism between Asymptotism and Tangentiability.

This aspect cannot include parallelism as an inversion of the two basic characteristics that are inverse by their functional nature and not by the parallelism which is defined more as a "coexistence" or as being two elements included in a certain system and by no means as a parallelism that gives them the functionality as such to both Asymptotism and Tangentiability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The parallelism between two elements does not mean the fact that this one gives them the inversion of one compared to another.

Can be parallel and two elements which are not inverse, one, compared to another, as is the case with Asymptotism and Tangentiability.

This aspect nominates the fact that it is not the parallelism that gives the functionality of a certain element.

By functionality is understood the Logical origin aspect of a Function, respectively the aspect of the Logical Function which interferes with all other aspects of other functions becoming their essence through the characteristic of essentialization of the Logical Function, a characteristic that defines thus the functionality as being an interference of the Logical Function within other functional systems.

Thus the other functional systems to which the "Logical Function" is applied form the domain of the arguments of the function, and the multitude of values of the function is the domain of its values.

The fact that Coaxiological Truth is a Relative Truth is due to Reporting, first and foremost as I have written in other works of mine, which is that one which defines the eternal Relativity of the Coaxiological Truth, a Relativity defined by the eternal Everything, that will be in the Back of the Everything, defined as being the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, which is always in the Back of Universal Pure Language defined by Everything, and which due to this, it will eternally determine a new and new Word -Matrix within this Universal Pure Language.

This Word -Matrix that could not have been determined at all if it were not the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness which to be defined as an Everything from the Back of Everything, in which Everything is reported, and thus, this reporting to have as a

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

result a new and new Word -Matrix, determining the "Infinite Continuum" of the Universal Pure Language and implicitly once with it and the "Logical Continuum", because, the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, in its capacity as the Back of Everything is defined by its reporting on Everything.

Everything is defined by its reporting on the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

Once Everything is an "Infinite Continuum", and the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness will receive this desideratum of continuity from the continuity of Universal Pure Language, which is Everything, and this desideratum of continuity of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness will be defined as being a continuity belonging to the Logical Function, because the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is defined as being an appanage of the Logical Function that occurred with the Asymptotism and Tangentiability, generating the first parallelism, and once with this the Coaxiological Truth.

This parallelism has been emphasized on what defines both the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness through its Asymptotism and the Universal Pure Language through its Tangentiability.

The Asymptotism, defines the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, because it eternally "surrounds" Everything, defining itself as being the Everything, from the Back of Everything, or, the Back of Everything, precisely due to its Asymptotism, being determined by the symbolic tendency in this example of my, of the two lines, one to the other, which never unite, leaving this desideratum to Universal Pure Language, where each such Word -Matrix is defined by Tangentiability, the inverse of Asymptotism.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Thus the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness will eternally incorporate the Asymptotism, highlighted by the human mind as being the Infinite, which will eternally encompass the Finite highlighted by the same slave human mind of the Logical Coefficient 2, because if they reasoned on the basis of another Logical Coefficient, together with the Infinite and Finite, would be and other opposite terms of theirs, equivalent in number, to the number of the Logical Coefficient on the basis of which, they will be able to judge and reason finally.

Even if we attribute, the Asymptotism to the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, it can be defined as anything other than Asymptotism, being also, according to the Logical Coefficient on the basis of which it is reasoned.

The Asymptotism is seen as such (Asymptotism) only within the worlds where it is thought based on Logical Coefficient 2, as is and our world, with good and evil, beautiful and ugly, etc.

In case that, it will reason with another Logical Coefficient, Asymptotism can be seen as being anything else, than the Asymptotism, being altogether different highlighted, than it is emphasized to us in quality of human beings.

What we reason as being Asymptotism, the same is true for Tangentiability, being as significant as possible, the appanage of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, and, the Tangentiability, the appanage of the Universal Pure Language.

In this case, does it mean that there is a connection between the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness and the asymptotism from the base of the Logical Function, so that, that Asymptotism to be defined by another Unique Expression of any other Universal Pure Consciousness or the same by this?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

In this case, would it mean that the Intangible Forms were not the basis of Asymptotism, but precisely the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness?

**NOT! No way!**

The Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is found as a determinate of the Logical Function and not vice versa, ie the Logical Function to be the determinate of this Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, and the respective Expression to be the determinant of the Logical Function.

**This is not possible and I completely oppose such a model on the grounds that any Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness must first of all meet a certain Logic based on a certain Truth, in our case being the Coaxiological Truth.**

How could we define an Expression without Truth or without any grain of Logic?

Logic without Truth cannot be, because it has no relevance.

When Asymptotism through its parallelism defined alongside Tangentiality determines the defining of the Coaxiological Truth, defines once with it and the Logical Function, and the Unique Expression of some Universal Pure Consciousness coming from elsewhere does NOT define the Logical Function.

As I said before, the Unique Expression of a Consciousness cannot be without a certain Logical highlighting of that Expression, the Logic by which this Expression is defined.

However, in my works I have frequently written that this Logical Function can Not be defined as the Logic of Knowledge that we, humans know as being Logic and to which we report.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Once it is a completely different Logic based on other principles, could this Logical Function not be at all without the Coaxiological Truth?

I have also written about the fact that the Logical Function determines the Coaxiological Truth and once with this it distinguishes on itself as being true.

The Coaxiological Truth is defined through the Logical Function, but the Logical Function cannot be fully defined with the Coaxiological Truth, because she is the one that determines the Coaxiological Truth, identifying itself from that moment, which probably coincides with the Tangentiability, with this Coaxiological Truth defined precisely by the parallelism through which the Logical Function is defined as such, only that that parallelism arises only after the Logical Function has determined him, determining itself through him on self, so that the parallelism will determine **through** the Logical Function the Coaxiological Truth and **not** the Coaxiological Truth will determine through parallelism the Logical Function.

However, why we could not attribute to a Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness the primacy alongside the Logical Function which to outrun the Coaxiological Truth and why not the Logical Function, because even so I have previously stated that the Logic of the Logical Function is a totally different Logic from what we people know about Logic, a Logic that is no longer attributed to Knowledge, defined through Knowledge, so as a part of the Gnoseological, but a totally different Logic, which outruns even the Coaxiological Truth.

Why, it would not have the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, such a Logic, and why it could not outrun even and the Logical Function, so the Expression to be not only "before" the Coaxiological Truth but also by the Logical Function, if it still does not we are talking about that Logic to which we, the human beings the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

adepts and slaves of Logical Coefficient 2, refer, through which any Expression must focus on a certain Logic, and this Logic must be focused on a certain Truth.

**Indeed, if a Logic is not based on a certain Truth it cannot be defined as a Logic reported to an Illogical, for example.**

How do we know that when the Logical Function was determined through the Asymptotic-Tangential parallelism, it was a Logical Function if it will have to define the Coaxiological Truth and not vice versa, namely the Coaxiological Truth to define this Logical Function?

My answer is that through that parallelism, the Logic of the Logical Function was determined by the Reporting of Asymptotism to Tangentiability, defined as its inverse.

This reporting defined a Logic through a certain **Order** defined by this reporting that had a basis in the Intangible Forms.

This **Order** was in fact the essence of the Logical Function, which in turn defined the Coaxiological Truth.

**The order being nothing but parallelism defined as such by reporting the Asymptotism to Tangentiability.**

However, for us, as humans, is highlighted us as Order, but if we were to reason on the basis of another Logical Coefficient, the respective Order could be completely something else.

The Order defines through itself the Logical Function, as being a Logic in itself.

Any Order is a Logic, just as any Disorder is a Logic to the Order.

Thus both Order and Disorder are Logics which report to each other, just like the Asymptotism, to Tangentiability.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Any Order can be Disorder compared to the Order of Disorder and vice versa, any Disorder can be Order, compared to the Disorder of Order.

The Coaxiological Truth is defined both in relation to the Order of the Logical Function and to the Disorder to which it relates, respectively at the Illogical.

Where, it is the Logic, it will always be and the Illogical, because otherwise Logic would have no relevance.

The Coaxiological Truth does nothing else but to complete through himself the Logical Function, namely through the fact that once defined by the Logical Function, this **recognizes through the Coaxiological Truth** the multitude of its meanings, and once with these meanings, its reporting to other and other determinations or indeterminacies to which it participates not only as a Logical Function defined by the Asymptotic-Tangential Parallelism, but also by its Logical implication of to define meanings that cannot be defined unless these are reported to its own Truth of the Logical Function which is the Coaxiological Truth.

These meanings are not only defined by the Logic and Illogical determined by us also due to the Logical Coefficient 2, but especially by other and other such meanings determined and by other Logical Coefficients that are much superior than those of the human being.

Thus the Logical Function becomes true by its reporting to itself and by no means by its determination by a certain Unique Expression coming and determined by the Intangible Forms, for example.

This plurality of meanings is not one of Semantic or Neosemantic typology, etc; although in this fact it consists the essence of the meanings, respectively, of the Neosemantic and Semantic, which thus develops through the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Admitting, to absurd, that there would exist such a Unique Expression that would determine both Asymptotism and Tangentiability.

This would mean that there should be and another Truth before the Coaxiological Truth, because we cannot speak of a Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness if it is Not focused on a certain Truth of it and through which the respective Unique Expression must be reported, so that it is defined.

If this Truth existed before the Coaxiological Truth then, and, the Logical Function would be finalized by another Truth, and therefore would be a resultant of that Truth.

In this case we could not define Asymptotism as such, because Asymptotism would be True only according to its Truth and not of the one of Logical Function.

*Assuming that and this would be possible, the question that arises is whether Truth can define the Logic in the absence of Knowledge?*

*If the Truth can define a Logic as the appanage of a gnoseology as we understand it, but totally, in the absence of the respective gnoseology? Why do I say this?*

Because only in Knowledge, can the Truth define a certain structuralization or reporting based on Logic.

In the absence of Knowledge, the Logical Function is the one that defines and determines the Truth through the things stated by me above.

Assuming, at, absurd, that and thus could be defined all these, and that the Logical Function would be determined by a certain external Truth as a fact of a certain Intervention of the Intangible Forms for example.

The question that arises is whether that Intervention is True, it must define itself to its own Non-Truth.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

And we return again as and in the Coaxiological Logic, to the duplex due to the Logical Coefficient 2 of Intervention -Nonintervention and Order-Chaos.

If the Intervention is a Truth then he consists of the Non-Intervention because he has to report himself to the inverse of what the Intervention is, for it to be True.

If the Truth of the Intervention consists of the Non-Intervention, you can judge and alone, why we cannot define a Truth previous or exterior to the Logical Function, than a Coaxiological Truth determined by the Logical Function.

Judging at absurd that the Truth of the Intervention would consist of the Non-Intervention, because, only at this the Intervention can be reported, for to be True.

Wouldn't the Non-Intervention have the Truth precisely in the Intervention?

Of course, YES!

Once the Truth of the Intervention consists in the Non-Intervention and the one of the Non-Intervention consists in the Intervention, it means that neither of the two, IS NOT TRUE!

Therefore Truth cannot be defined as a determinant of the Logical Function but only as a determinate of this function.

Each Truth is Relative by its reporting to other Truths and Absolute by its reporting to the plurality of its determinants, compared to which the respective Truth is Unique.

This case was explained by me in the "Coaxiological Logic" through the Unique Intervention of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally , Intervention which by its Unicity also represents the Absolute Truth of our world.

Of course, this was just an example from the infinity of other possible examples, because absolutely

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

anything determines and is determined, in order to become, in turn, a determinant, it possesses both an Absolute Truth of its own, through which the respective determinant is Unique compared to the plurality of determinants which it determines them, as well as a Relative Truth of its own, being and him in turn a determinant from another plurality of determinants for which another determinant is Absolute Truth in its turn, so a unique determinant for the plurality of determinants from which and this determinant is part, for to be Unique in turn compared to its plurality of determinants which it will determine.

Thus, each determinant is Unique in relation to the plurality of determinants which it determines, but at the same time and he is part of another plurality of other determinants which, and they, in their turn, have been determined by an Unique determinant.

This process demonstrates us that each Truth is both Relative Truth and Absolute Truth, depending on the landmark to which it is reported.

This justifies us to affirm that every Truth which is Absolute is also Relative in its turn, what Relativizes and the Absolute part of that Truth, because it is Absolute, only, reported to a certain Landmark and not to another, and when it becomes reported and to other Landmarks, becomes Relative.

If we introduce Everything in the equation, in which it is included both the Landmark compared to which the Truth becomes Absolute, and the Landmarks compared to which the Truth is no longer Absolute, we come to realize that, in fact it does NOT exist the Absolute Truth in no form, than only at the level of reporting of its, and then to an infinity of reportings, only one of these can be considered as being an absolute reporting of that Truth. Why?

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

This is explained by the fact that if we thought through a Logical Coefficient one billion and one, and not 2, as is in the case of the human being, we would have a billion relative reportings upon other landmarks and only an absolute reporting, and, if we have thinking at the level of the Infinite Logical Coefficient, then we would have an infinity of relative reportings (Relative Truths) and only an absolute reporting (Absolute Truth).

This fact demonstrates us how insignificant is "percentage" of absolute of a Truth, compared to its percentage of Relativity.

More than that, even that percentage of absolute of the respective Truth is Relative depending on other Landmarks.

Thus, the Absolute Truth is and he, a Relative Truth, even though we call it as being Absolute to other landmarks, becoming the Absolute Truth, only and only for one Landmark compared to which it differentiates as being Unique.

This fact is the one that underlies the differentiation between the Finite and the Infinite, between the simple and the complex, between the opposites, but also the one that is the basis of the Reportings what will precede the Determinants and Indeterminants of the Coaxiological Logic.

Why are such large differences between the "Infinite Continuum" represented through combinative forms, of the Everything, of the Universal Pure Language, and, the Unique Expression of the Pure Universal Consciousness, represented through suggestive forms?

*Why, through suggestivity?*

*Does the Suggestiveness in itself have anything to do with the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness?*

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

About the suggestion we find in most dictionaries that it is a process of influencing the psychic, or the behavior of a person without that it to realize of the origin of this influence, without manifesting a spirit independent of discernment.

I did not accidentally name those forms of the Coaxiology as being suggestive forms, and which represent the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

And in Coaxiology, the suggestion is similar to the definition given so far by the philosophy that precedes the Coaxialism, where it is a process of influencing on someone or "something" without that that "something" to realize the origin of this influence.

What greater resemblance can be within the suggestive forms through which the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is represented on certain reportings, which although it is a Supreme Consciousness of Everything, but especially of Everything from the Back of Everything, is **NOT** focused on Knowledge, for that that " something " will know by realizing the origin of the influence that I had previously mentioned.

That Influence comes to us, the people, through the suggestive forms as being the Intervention, which for us is the essence of the Suggestive, Unique and Incidentally Intervention of our Creator Factor.

We humans, do not express an independent spirit of discernment with regard to the respective Intervention precisely because it precedes Destiny as being the Unique and Incidentally Intervention.

It is observed how well this term of suggestibility concretizes by which I have defined the suggestive forms attributed by their suggestive to the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness.

The Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is the one that underlies of Influencing of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

the "Infinite Continuum" through the medium of which the "Infinite Continuum" is "Continuum" precisely because this Influence is given by the Everything which is always in the Back of the Everything and which is the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

This Influence is made without the cognoscible discernment of the Everything defined through the "Infinite Continuum" where Knowledge is a simple Word - Matrix from the infinity of such Words - Matrices.

How the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is defined as being an Everything alongside the "Infinite Continuum" for the reporting to the "Logical Continuum", where the "Logical Continuum" will be the one that will "determine" the Back of that Everything, becoming he this time the Everything from the Back of Everything, means that the "Logical Continuum" has discernment, because it is reported and at the Word - Matrix of Knowledge within the "Infinite Continuum", just as it is also reported on the whole Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, which means that Everything defined by the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness is "Known" and by the "Logical Continuum" as being the supreme form of the Everything but also of the Everything from the Back of the Everything.

This determines us to understand the fact that any Logical Function defined through its "Logical Continuum" is a Function which among other and other infinities of attributes of its, determined by the reportings at the infinities of Words -Matrices and KNOWS, being a Logical Function which has discernment!

Thus any Logic can be defined as having its own discernment in itself and for itself.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

So the Everything, which follows a certain logic, even and our face, is based on a certain discernment independent of the human brain, a discernment of which the Man is not aware, reaching him on suggestive ways, but which is the one what determines absolutely all the conjunctures of Logical order, starting with the laws that occur after certain logical structuralizations and up to the level of the most bizarre concordances or non-concordances, but which clearly show that they have a Logical correlate being attributed to a series of Events, etc., which occur in life and day-to-day experiences of the Man.

Therefore, any logical arrangements have their own discernment and nothing from this world as well as from all the worlds, where the divine breath of the "Logical Continuum" is, does not occur without discernment.

In conclusion, the "Logical Continuum" and the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, Knows, only the "Infinite Continuum" does Not Know!

Its influence on the "Infinite Continuum" is a suggestive one.

I have said many times before that the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness does not encompass the Universal Pure Language composed from the infinity of Words -Matrices, but are reported to these, as a Whole at another Whole.

This reporting as, a Everything to another Everything, is the reporting of the Everything defined through the Universal Pure Language of the "Infinite Continuum" to the Everything, defined through the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness.

This reporting is given by all the Words -Matrices that are reported thus to the Unique Expression, defining it,

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

but also redefining it "Continuum" on it, and once with the continuous redefinition of the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, another reporting is determined, which is the reporting of the "Logical Continuum" both at the "Infinite Continuum" and at the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

Thus for the "Logical Continuum", the Everything is both the "Infinite Continuum" and the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness.

So, the Everything, inclusive the Everything from the Back of Everything again forms an Everything for which the Back of Everything becomes the "Logical Continuum".

The Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness not only that is reported to all the Words - Matrices of the Universal Pure Language, but within this infinity of Words -Matrices there is inclusively the Word - Matrix of Knowledge, and, through the reporting and at this Word -Matrix of Knowledge we can deduce that the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness **KNOWS**, and this aspect determines us to decide that her self is not one represented through **suggestive forms**, **because it discerns** through Knowledge, the Everything, defined through the Universal Pure Language of the "Infinite Continuum".

In conclusion, the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness can be defined as the element that determines the suggestive forms, and therefore for us people when we want to define the suggestive it will have to we attribute it to the Unique Expression of the Universal Pure Consciousness, the one that determines the suggestive, only that her self is not defined through suggestion having the discernment, due to the reporting to the "Infinite Continuum" in the Pure Language whose is also the Word -Matrix of Knowledge.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

*If it is an Unique Expression compared to the Universal Pure Language, does that mean that and the Truth which represents her, is an Absolute Truth compared to this Universal Pure Language, but not compared to other landmarks?*

It is as true as possible that the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness represents compared to the Universal Pure Language, an Absolute Truth, but not compared to the "Logical Continuum" for example.

This Absolute Truth reported to this Universal Pure Language indicates to us that only thus can the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness be Unique, reported at this Universal Pure Language, because this Unique Expression represents the Absolute Truth of Universal Pure Language compared to which, the Universal Pure Language becomes relative.

In this case, we must necessarily define the concept of uniqueness and at this level, because it is no longer defined by the disjunctive function that intervenes and acts on the Word -Matrix, Unique, or on the Word -Matrix Incidentally, because this uniqueness of the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness it cannot be taken from the Universal Pure Language that it defines him once with the reporting to it.

Therefore, the respective uniqueness arises on a completely different paths from those determined and known until now, namely through the disjunctive function that intervenes separately upon each Word -Matrix, in part.

Moreover, each Word -Matrix is defined by a determinant of the Truth, having thus included in its own development, its own Truth.

Each Word -Matrix if it is to we define it by its matrix part, we get to determine the very notion of matrices which by definition as any dictionary shows us, is a table

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

representing the truth value of an enunciation, based on the truth value of its component elements.

For example, noting the truth with 1 and false with 0, the table:

A	B
1	1
1	0
0	1
0	0

A and B
1
0
0
0

represents the matrix of the statement "A and B".

The first two columns of the table represent the truth values of the components, and the third the truth value of the enunciation as, a whole.

In the proportional calculation the matrix of operators represents precisely their definitions.

This is in fact the universal definition of a matrix that we people can give it based on Logical Coefficient 2 of our judgment so limited.

Absolutely any system that has its own inherence on the basis of which it can develop a certain degree of inertiality compared to the rigor of meanings so common but also so misunderstood, can be defined immediately on the basis of a table.

This table will be a continuous reporting to a Truth without which its definition but also its inertial quality would become null.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

I say "inertiality", because absolutely any enunciation which has as a basis of reporting to one of the truths that can develop other and other truths determined by it can be defined as a table which is especially a system with its own autonomous regeneration capacity.

The truth itself is the one that can give the autonomy of each system in part becoming an inertial system, and through this inertiality, that system no longer gravitates as a part of another system, but becomes a self-contained system precisely because it is a true system.

However much we would like to get the truth out of the respective equation and define the matrix apart from the truth it is impossible for us.

This means that any matrix, as I said and in Coaxiological Logic, has as basis, the Coaxiological Truth, which identifies with the "Logical Continuum" defining the Universal Pure Language ("Infinite Continuum") and once with it, the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness.

The fact that absolutely every Word -Matrix is defined in its development by Truth, it means that the Coaxiological Truth is at the base of it.

As I have said before, absolutely any Truth can be both Relative Truth and Absolute Truth.

It all depends on the reference system to which this Truth refers, namely, if the Reference System of a Truth is the Unique determinant of other reference systems that are validated each by their own Truths, then it means that the Unique Truth for all other Truths, it will be Absolute Truth for these, like all other Truths will be Relative Truths, and each of these Relative Truths will in turn become Absolute Truths for other reference systems compared to which, these are unique.

In this case from the example with the Unique Expression of Universal Pure Consciousness, this is in its

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

capacity as a reference system defined by a Unique Truth, which becomes implicitly the Absolute Truth for Universal Pure Language.

Thus, the Absolute Truth is not defined as a Truth that belongs only and only to the Word -Matrix of Knowledge, but also to other systems and structuralizations, only that they appear only in this book, defined as such according to the Truth.

Therefore, the Absolute Truth is not a Truth in the true sense of the Word, such as the Coaxiological Truth for example, but is rather a particular characteristic of Truths.

Therefore absolutely any Truth in part can be both Absolute Truth and Relative Truth.

It is sad for us, the people, who we have such a limited judgment based on the always lamentable Logical Coefficient 2, that, we cannot know and other Status Characteristics of the Truths, apart from the two characteristics, namely: the Relativity and Absolute, which are defined by multilaterality in the framework of relativity and uniqueness, within the absolute.

If we were to reason on the basis of other Logical Coefficients in front of our mind's eyes, there would appear and other, Status Characteristics of the Truths, which would be increasingly wonderful and would integrate us into an increasingly fantastic reality.

**In conclusion, any Truth is a Relative Truth but also Absolute at the same time.**

**Each Truth is Absolute for the Landmarks for which this is Unique and Relative for the Landmarks for which this is not Unique.**

**The Relative Truth which for us humans is the Absolute Truth, is the Intervention of the Creator Factor and Unique Incidentally.**

**No Absolute Truth can not be Truncated, so it is divided into several parts, where each such Trunk of the**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Absolute Truth to be a fragment from it, because each such Trunk is another Truth within itself, which is both Absolute Truth for the Landmarks for which this is Unique as well as Relative Truth for the Landmarks for which this is not Unique.

The Absolute Truth must always be Unique for the Landmarks compared to which this is Absolute, because in comparison to those Landmarks, the Absolute Truth CANNOT be divided into smaller Absolute Truths, and thus divided, to we can speak of more Absolute Truths, because in this case each Truncated Truth from the Absolute Truth has another determinant of it and therefore it is another Truth as I have repeatedly said and it is by no means a part, from the Absolute Truth, that cannot be truncated.

Therefore we can NOT talk about several Truths whose sum to determine the Absolute Truth, and each such part from the Absolute Truth to be a Truth which to reflect "partially" the Absolute Truth.

Nothing is more false than this, because any Absolute Truth cannot be Truncated, since the Absolute Truth is the Absolute Truth, only and only in comparison to the Landmarks for which this is Unique!, becoming Relative Truth for all the other Landmarks in comparison to which this is not Unique.

Each Truth in part, is both Absolute Truth and Relative Truth.

The difference between the Absolute and the Relative consists in the way of reporting of this one to certain Landmarks.

The Landmarks in comparison to which the Truth is Absolute are Landmarks for which this Truth is the Unique and supreme determinant of the Everything and All, as is the Intervention of our Creating Factor.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**From this Intervention, as from this Unique and supreme determinant, all other Relative Truths spring, reported to the respective Landmarks, but only and only, reported to the respective Landmarks in comparison to which, the respective Truth is Unique, thus becoming Absolute.**

**All other Truths that will report to the respective Landmarks will no longer be Unique, but will be Relative depending on certain circumstances arising from the reporting of several Truths where each Truth in part, becomes a possibility.**

**Thus every Relative Truth, however insignificant it may seem to us, is also an Absolute Truth for the Landmarks in comparison to which it is Unique.**

**The question that arises is why for us each non-insignificant Truth or even a colossal significance is not Unique, even if it is not Absolute Truth, but Relative Truth?**

**As I said before, each Relative Truth is and Absolute Truth reported to other and other Landmarks different from us people.**

**If the Intervention of the Creator Factor is an Absolute Truth for us humans, this Intervention in relation to other and other Landmarks is a Relative Truth so it is not a Unique Truth being Relative.**

**Only the Absolute Truth is a Unique Truth.**

**Even if and the Absolute Truth of ours is NOT Unique than for us humans, or the similar Landmarks with us, it means that each Relative Truth has both its Unique part for the Landmarks in comparison to which it is Absolute Truth but and its Relative part for the Landmarks in comparison to which it is Truth Relative.**

**Each Truth is also for us, humans, Unique in its own way.**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

This "Unique in its own way" indicates to us the duplicity of each Truth in part, a duplicity by which this can be both Absolute Truth and Relative Truth, all depending on the Landmarks to which it is reported.

The fact for which an Absolute Truth must be Unique for its Landmarks in comparison to which this is Absolute Truth, is due to the reasoning through which any Truth that does not determine through reporting to him, all other Relative Truths, is NOT an Absolute Truth.

What exactly could determine all other Relative Truths than the Unique and Incidentally Intervention of the Creator Factor from where our own world started?

If a very small part of all the other Relative Truths were determined "beforehand" by the Intervention of our Creator Factor, then this Intervention would NOT have been Unique since next to it would be Intervened and other determinants like her.

Therefore the Intervention could Not have been reported, to us, humans, to our Absolute Truth, being relativized by the reporting to the other Truths that would have intervened once with it and thus we could not give to it this aspect of Absolute.

Through its meaning, the Absolute means in the first instance Everything, and when we speak of the Absolute Truth, this must include within it the Everything, that is to determine in turn all the other Truths, because it can Not to include them, because I have previously demonstrated, that any Truth Truncated cannot be part from the Absolute Truth because this is either Whole or is not at all.

The Absolute Truth does not include all other Truths whose sum is precisely the Absolute Truth.

**NO, by no means!**

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

The Absolute Truth determines through his Whole and indivisible self, all other Truths through its reporting to certain Landmarks exterior to the Absolute Truth itself, because all the other Landmarks in comparison to which the respective Truth is Absolute Truth, are Landmarks where each such Landmark in part is defined through a Relative Truth which is reported to the Absolute Truth, defined and him as Unique Landmark in comparison to all other Landmarks, Unique Landmark that determines by its Uniqueness all other Landmarks.

This Unique Landmark of the Absolute Truth in the case of man is the Intervention of our Creator Factor.

The Intervention of our Creator Factor determines all the other Landmarks of the worlds in comparison to which the Intervention becomes Unique and Incidentally.

Thus the Absolute Truth of Man is an Absolute Truth, Unique and Incidentally, and all the Logic of Man is a Logic where, due to the Absolute Truth to which, this one is reported, it gives him the character of considering the Unique and Incidentally as belonging to the Absolute.

This is the Logic considered by Man as being the one who establishes the rule of the game between him and the Truths to which he relates.

It is a Logic of Man different from Coaxiological Logic where are an infinity of Absolute Truths like are an infinity of Relative Truths, because each Absolute Truth is also Relative Truth.

The logic of man is used as a Logic that becomes a consciousness of the Universal Language by Husserl and hence starts the phenomenology, while at me this is only a Logic of Man and by no means the Coaxiological

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

**Logic for which the respective Logic of man has no longer any relevance, being based on Knowledge, and Knowledge in its turn is a simple Word -Matrix, from the infinity of other Words- Matrices of the "Infinite Continuum".**

**In conclusion, the Absolute Truth cannot be divided into several Truths, like the sum of many Truths will never be the Absolute Truth, because all those Truths have each, in them their own Absolute Truth as well as their own Relative Truth, which, is due to the Landmarks upon which they report.**

If we take the planet Earth, for example, and we consider her, absurdly, that it would be the Absolute Truth, and, an ant living on this planet as being a Relative Truth, just like an elephant.

In quality of, Landmarks, both the elephant and the ant are two Landmarks that are part of the Great Landmark which is the planet Earth.

I agree that the sum of these Landmarks, made up of all plants, animals, humans, etc., make up the Landmark (system) called planet Earth.

The fact that all these Landmarks are each in part a Relative Truth apart from the planet Earth, on which through absurd in this example we consider her to be an Absolute Truth is equally true.

Then why does the sum of these Relative Truths, which are the totality of plants, animals, humans, etc., NOT make up the Absolute Truth that is the planet Earth in this example, since in quality of elements of this system they are part of the Great Landmark that is the planet Earth?

All this is due to the fact that any Truth is defined as being a reporting to a particular Landmark.

Totality of the plants, animals, people within the planet Earth, is another Landmark, they are also Relative Truths, reported to the planet Earth.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Totality of the plants, animals, people within the planet Earth which is another Landmark, are Relative Truths, reported to the planet Earth.

But let's not forget that every Landmark alongside the fact that is a Relative Truth is also Absolute Truth.

Thus the ant in quality of a Landmark is part of the Landmark (system), which is the planet Earth, but only in quality of an ant (Relative Truth) and not of Absolute Truth, so of part, from the planet Earth, because the Absolute Truth of the ant is another, different from the one of the planet Earth.

And yet if the ant is part, in quality of Landmark, from the system which is the planet Earth, why is not part and the Landmark - ant defined as the Relative Truth from the Absolute Truth which is the planet Earth?

One is the Landmark that may or may not be part of a system and the other is Absolute Truth and Relative Truth.

The Absolute Truth of the Ant can never be part from the Absolute Truth of the planet Earth, because thus, the same Absolute Truth would become divided into several parts, and the question would be which is the most absolute part and which is not.

There is no such thing.

The ant will always be only a Relative Truth compared to the Absolute Truth of the Earth for example, it can never be part from the Absolute Truth of the Earth which is Unique, like the Unique is and the Absolute Truth of the ant and that despite the fact that the ant is part in quality of Landmark, from the Landmark (system) which is Earth.

When we affirm the Truth about planet Earth, we do not look at this planet as being a system with ants, humans, animals but we see her as All, as a planet, and if we want to see what other Landmarks are in this system that is the

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

planet Terra, and herself a Landmark in her turn, will have to we consider, as being true each Landmark, in part, from the planet.

When we affirm the Truth about the ant, we report strictly to the ant and not to the planet Earth, we are going to report us to the planet Earth only when we want to know where the ant lives and finally we come to this planet.

So we get here, reporting the Truth about the fact that the ant exists as such, at, the planet Earth, which is one of the Landmarks to which the ant is reported in quality of the Landmark, which gives it the quality of Relative Truth in comparison to the Truth of the planet Earth.

Can the Relative Truths be included, some in other, or can they be divided or gathered compared to the Absolute Truths about which I have demonstrated that this cannot be done?

Neither Relative Truths, can not be divided, because any Truth that is Truncated, has another determinant, so we can never speak of the sum of some Relative Truths which to determine another Relative Truth, due to the fact that no matter how many Truths are and whether these are Relative (the plurality) or Absolute (the uniqueness), they always define one and the same determinant and never another!

How can they not define other determinants in the case of Relative Truths when these define precisely the plurality?

By the fact that Relative Truths define the plurality, it does not mean that there are more Relative Truths that define the same determinant, but more Relative Truths which each in part define a determinant reported to a single Absolute Truth, which also defines his determinant.

The differentiation between the Relative Truths and Absolute Truth does NOT consist in the fact that the determinants of Relative Truths are included or fit in the Absolute Truth, but in the fact that the determinants of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

Relative Truths are reported to a single determinant, which for them is the Absolute Truth, just like each such determinant of Relative Truths is and he, in turn, a determinant that other Relative Truths consider him the Absolute Truth.

In conclusion, no Truth regardless of whether it is Absolute or Relative cannot be Truncated, because if we considered, at absurd, that is Truncated it would be another Truth having another determinant.

And the example with the ant shows us clearly the fact that when we report to the ant we report to her Truth, to the fact that the ant exists, that it has certain qualities, appearance, etc., and only then can we report her at the Earth, and in no case, when we report to the Truth that is the Earth, the ant will not appear to us in front, but the Earth as a planet.

No Truth can be divided, just as the sum of several Truths never determines another Truth, because each Truth is both Absolute Truth and Relative Truth, and there can never be a sum from several Absolute Truths, because each such Absolute Truth involves Everything!

The Truths do not divide and do not gather but report, one to another because they are always, eternal, unchanged!

Each Determinant is both an Absolute Truth and a Relative Truth.

The Determinant is an Absolute Truth when it determines in turn other Determinate that become Determinants, and is Relative Truth when it is a Determinate of another Determinant.

When the respective Determinant in quality of Absolute Truth, therefore of Determinant which determines its own Determined ones, is reported to its own Determinant compared to which it is Determined, then this is a Landmark compared to its Determinant, being a

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

reporting of the Determinant in quality of Absolute Truth to a Determined one of his, which is regarded all in his capacity as an Absolute Truth, so of Determinant which has his own Determined ones, and not a Determined one of his own Determinant, thus being a Relative Truth.

Therefore, the Determinant will always be the Absolute Truth and the Determined will be the Relative Truth.

Always, the Determinant will determine more Determined ones where each in turn they will become Determinants.

Thus, the Determinant (Absolute Truth) will determine more Determinates (Relative Truths).

When we report two Determinants, in fact, we report two Absolute Truths that become Landmarks one compared to another.

When we report two Determinates, we report two Relative Truths which become Included in the Landmarks of their own Determinants or Absolute Truths, but also according to their own Absolute Truths, so of Landmarks through which they are Determinants in their turn.

Thus any reporting of two or more Determinants as well as of two or more Determinates such as between a Determined and a Determinant or between a Determinant and a Determined is done only and only by reporting what each means in its capacity as Determinant to his own Determinates, therefore by Absolute Truth.

As all the Determinants have their own Determinates, and the Determinates have their own Determinants through the fact that their Determinates become Determinants, it means that each Determinant is at Infinite Level, Everything in Everything, like each Determined is Everything in Everything, and thus is completed, the Theory of the Eternal Everything and of the Eternal Everything from the Back of Everything.

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

## Books published

### *Sapiential Literature*

---

#### **Volumes of aphorisms**

- The Future of Artificial Intelligence -philosophical aphorisms, contains **3135** aphorisms, the United States of America 2020
- The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence - philosophical aphorisms, contains **4162** aphorisms, the United States of America 2020
- Destinul Inteligenței Artificiale Conține un număr de **505** aforisme, Statele Unite ale Americii 2020; Destiny of Artificial Intelligence **505** aphorisms, the United States of America 2020
- Iubire și Absurd contains **449** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019 ; Love and Absurd contains **449** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2020
- Impactul Inteligenței Artificiale asupra Omenirii contains **445** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019; The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Mankind **445** aphorisms, the United States of America 2019

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Credință și Sfintenie la Om și Mașină contains **749** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019; Faith and Holiness at Man and Machine **749** aphorisms, the United States of America 2019
- Necunoscutul absurd contains **630** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019; The Unknown Absurd philosophical aphorisms, contains **630** aphorisms, the United States of America 2020
- Viitorul îndepărtat al omenirii contains **727** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019; The Far Future of Mankind contains **727** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019
- Culegere de Înțelepciune – Aforisme filosofice esențiale – Ediția 2019 contains **13222** aphorisms - Statele Unite ale Americii 2019
- Dovada Existenței Lumii de Apoi contains **709** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019; Proof of the Existence of the Afterlife World contains **709** aphorisms, Statele Unite ale Americii 2019
- Culegere de Înțelepciune - Opere Complete de Aforisme - Ediție de Referință the United States of America 2019; Wisdom Collection - Complete Works of Aphorisms - Reference Edition 2019, contains **12,513** aphorisms- the United States of America 2019

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Judecători the United States of America 2019 ;  
Judges –contains 1027 aphorisms, the United States of America 2019
- Culegere de Înțelepciune - Opere Complete de Aforisme - Ediție de Referință Wisdom Collection - Complete Works of Aphorisms - Reference Edition, contains **11,486 aphorisms** structured in 14 volumes previously published in other publishers, which are included in the current collection. 2014
- Dumnezeu și Destin, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2014, God and Destiny, the United States of America, 2014
- Rătăcire, Paco Publishing House, Romania 2013, Wandering, the United States of America, 2014
- Libertate, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2013, Freedom the United States of America, 2013
- Cugetări esențiale, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2013
- Antologie de înțelepciune, the United States of America 2012 Anthology of wisdom , the United States of America, 2012 contains 9578 aphorisms
- Contemplare, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, Contemplation, the United States of America, 2012

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Deșertăciune, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2011, Vanity, the United States of America, 2011
- Paradisul și Infernul, Paco Publishing House, Romania 2011, Paradise and Inferno, the United States of America, 2011
- Păcatul, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2011, The Sin, the United States of America, 2011
- Iluminare, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2011  
Illumination, contains 693 aphorisms the United States of America, 2011
- Culegere de înțelepciune (Wisdom Collection) in which appear for the first time in Romanian the volumes Înțelepciune (The book of wisdom), Patima (The Book of Passion) and Iluzie și Realitate (The Book of Illusion and Reality), together with those reissued as Nemurire (The Book of Immortality), Învață să mori (The Book of the Dead) and Revelații (The Book of Revelations), volumes that appeared both separately and together in the collection in the online or printed English editions of United States, Wisdom Collection contains 7012 aphorisms the United States of America 2009
- The Book of Passion, the United States of America, 2010
- The Book of Illusion and Reality, the United States of America 2010

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- The book of wisdom, the United States of America 2010, contains 1492 aphorisms
- Învață să mori, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2009 , The Book of the Dead, the United States of America, 2010, contains 1219 aphorisms
- Nemurire, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2009, The Book of Immortality, the United States of America, 2010, contains 856 aphorisms
- Revelații 21 Decembrie 2012, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2008, The Book of Revelations, the United States of America, 2010, contains 2509 aphorisms

---

*Volumes of philosophical studies*

---

- Coaxialismul - Editie completa de referinta, First edition Romania 2007, the second, the United States of America 2010 The Coaxialism- Complete reference edition, the United States of America 2011
- Moarte, neant aneant viață și Bilderberg Group, First edition Romania 2007, the second, the United States of America 2010
- Logica coaxioologică, First edition , Romania 2007, the second, the United States of America 2014
- Starea de concepțiuie în fenomenologia coaxioologică, First edition Romania 2007, the second, the United States of America 2014
- Antichrist, ființă și iubire, First edition Romania 2007, the second, the United States of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

America 2012 The Evil, the United States of America 2014

- Iubire the United States of America 2012,  
Amour the United States of America 2010, Love, the United States of America 2012

---

*Volumes of philosophical poetry*

---

- Fără tine Iubire - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019
- Am crezut în Nemărginirea Iubirii -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019 ; I believed in the Eternity of Love - Philosophical poems-the United States of America 2019
- Te-am iubit-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019; I loved you - Philosophical poems-the United States of America 2019
- Să dansăm Iubire -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019
- Sfîntenia Iubirii -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019
- Steaua Nemuririi -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018 The Star of Immortality-Philosophical poems -the United States of America 2018
- Iluzia Mântuirii-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Întâmplare Neîntâmplătoare -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Singuratarea Nemuririi -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Drame de Companie -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Calea spre Absolut -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Dumnezeul meu -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Angoase existentiale-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018 Existential Anguishes - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Mai Singur -Philosophical poemsthe United States of America 2018 ; More lonely - Philosophical poems-the United States of America 2019
- Pe Umerii Lacrimii Unui Timp -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- În sălbăticia Sângelui -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Început și Sfârșit -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Marea Iluzie a Spargerii Totului Primordial - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Transcendental - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Amintirile Viitorului -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Înțelesul Iubirii – Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Tot ce a rămas din noi este Iubire - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Creația Iubirii - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Zâmbetul este floarea Sufletului - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Omul este o șoaptă mincinoasă a Creației- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Condiția Umană- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Agonia-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Iubire și Sacrificiu-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Disperare-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Statuile Vivante ale Absurdului-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018; The Living Statues of the Absurd - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Arta Absurdului Statuilor Vivante - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Absurd -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Greață și Absurdul -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Alienarea Absurdului-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Depresiile Absurdului Carismatic –Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Zilele fără adăpost ale Absurdului -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Stelele Căzătoare ale Durerii Lumii de Apoi - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Cunoasterea este adevărata Imagine a Mortii - Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Teatrul Absurd- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018; The Absurd Theater- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- Vise -Philosophical poemsthe United States of America 2018 ; Dreams- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018
- În Inima ta de Jar Iubire-Philosophical poemsthe United States of America 2018
  
- Nemurirea Iubirii -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2018, The Immortality of Love- Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019
- Timpul pierdut-Philosophical poemsthe United States of America 2018, The Lost Time -Philosophical poems the United States of America 2019

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Iluzia Existenței -Philosophical poems (Statele Unite ale Americii) 2017 The Illusion of Existence: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Existențialism - Philosophical poems (Statele Unite ale Americii) 2017 Existentialism: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Ființă și Neființă -Philosophical poems (Statele Unite ale Americii) 2017 Being and Nonbeing: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Oglinzile Paralele ale Genezei -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 The Parallel Mirrors of the Genesis: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Existenta si Timp -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 Existence and Time: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Obiecte de Cult -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 Objects of Worship: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Copacul Cunoașterii -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 The Tree of The Knowledge: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Iluzia Amintirii-Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017The Illusion of Memory: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Iluzia Mortii -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017The Illusion of Death: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Eternitate -Philosophical poems ( the United States of America) 2017 Eternity: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- Strainul Subconstient al Adevarului Absolut - Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2016
- Paradigma Eternitatii -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2016
- Marea Contemplare Universala -Philosophical poems the United States of America) 2016
- Bisericile Cuvintelor -Philosophical poems (the United States of America)2016
- Trafic de carne vie -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2016
- Vremurile Cuielor Tulburi -Philosophical poems (the United States of America)2016
- Divinitate -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2016

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- La Cabinetul Stomatologic -Philosophical poems  
(the United States of America) 2016
- Origami -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2016
- Dinainte de Spatiu si Timp -Philosophical poems  
(the United States of America) 2016
  
- A Fi Poet eLiteratura Publishing House,  
Bucureşti Romania 2015
- O Clipă de Eternitate eLiteratura Publishing  
House, Bucureşti Romania 2015
- Suntem o Hologramă eLiteratura Publishing  
House, Bucureşti Romania 2015
- Zile de Carton eLiteratura Publishing House,  
Bucureşti Romania 2015
- Fericire eLiteratura Publishing House,  
Bucureşti Romania 2015
- Nonsensul Existentei the United States of America  
2015 The Nonsense of Existence - Poems of Meditation  
the United States of America 2016
- Liberul arbitru the United States of America 2015  
The Free Will - Poems of Meditation the United States  
of America 2016
- Marile taceri the United States of America  
2015 The Great Silences - Poems of Meditation the  
United States of America 2016

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Ploii de Foc the United States of America  
2015 Rains of Fire - Poems of Meditation the United States of America 2016
- Moarte the United States of America 2015 Death - Poems of Meditation the United States of America 2016
- Iluzia Vietii the United States of America 2015 The Illusion of Life - Poems of Meditation the United States of America 2016
- Prin cimitirele viselor the United States of America 2015 Through The Cemeteries of The Dreams - Poems of Meditation the United States of America 2016
- Îngeri și Nemurire the United States of America 2014 Angels and Immortality - Poems of Meditation the United States of America 2017
- Politice the United States of America 2013
- Facerea lumii the United States of America 2013
- Cuvântul Lui Dumnezeu the United States of America 2013
- Alegerea Mantuitorului the United States of America 2013

---

*Volumes of poetry of philosophy of love*

---

- The Philosophy of Love - Dragoste și Destin - Philosophical poems (the United States of

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

America) 2017 The Philosophy of Love - Love and Destiny: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017

- The Philosophy of Love - Verighetele Privirilor - Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 The Philosophy of Love-The Wedding Rings of Glances-Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- The Philosophy of Love - Fructul Oprit - Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 The Philosophy of Love - The Forbidden Fruit: Philosophical poems the United States of America 2017
- The Philosophy of Love - Lacrimi -Philosophical poems (the United States of America) 2017 The Philosophy of Love- Tears: Philosophical poems the United States of America2017

---

*Volumes of poetry of love*

---

- Adresa unei cesti de cafea, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2013, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Memento Mori, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Parfum de eternitate, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Umbrele Inimilor, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Inimă de piatră amară, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Legendele sufletului, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Adevăr, Amintire, Iubire, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Eram Marile Noastre Iubiri, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2012, second edition, the United States of America, 2012
- Suflete pereche, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2011, second edition, the United States of America, 2011
- Templul inimii, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2011, second edition, the United States of America, 2011

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Poeme de dragoste, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2009, second edition, the United States of America, 2011

---

*Novels*

---

- *Destin*, Paco Publishing House, Romania, 2003
- *The trilogy Destiny* with the volumes *Psycho* *Apocalipsa* and *Exodus*, Paco Publishing House, Bucuresti, Romania 2004,
- *The origin of God* appeared in the United States of America with the volumes *The Divine Light*, *Psycho*, *The Apocalypse* and *Exodus* 2006
- *The Divine Light* appeared in the United States of America 2010

---

*Nonfiction volumes*

---

- Wikipedia pseudo-encyclopedia minciunii, cenzurii și dezinformării, appeared in English with the title : Wikipedia:Pseudo-encyclopedia of the lie, censorship and misinformation; The first critical book about Wikipedia that reveals the abuses, lies, mystifications from this encyclopedia – the United States of America – 2011
- Bible of the Light – the United States of America - 2011

**SORIN CERIN**  
**- THE COAXIOLOGICAL LOGIC -**

- Procesul Wikipedia – Drepturile omului, serviciile secrete și justiția din România – the United States of America - 2018